NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East-West Highway
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

CIS

S. Hrg. 102-1

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JANUARY 24, 1991

Printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
38-589 WASHINGTON : 1991

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-035340-8

J841-22

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Created by act of August 3, 1846 (9 Stat. 114)

SENATE	HOUSE
Wendell H. Ford, of Kentucky, *Chairman*	**Frank Annunzio**, of Illinois *Vice Chairman*
Dennis DeConcini, of Arizona	Joseph M. Gaydos, of Pennsylvania
Albert Gore, Jr., of Tennessee	Pat Roberts, of Kansas
Ted Stevens, of Alaska	Newt Gingrich, of Georgia
Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon	

John Chambers, Staff Director
Richard Oleszewski, Deputy Staff Director
Faye Padgett, Assistant Staff Director
Ron Kader, Auditor/Investigator
Ann Chambers, Professional Staff Member
Linda Kemp, Minority Staff
Shirley Woodrow, Minority Staff

CONTENTS

Page

Opening statement of Chairman Ford 1

Prepared statement of:

Senator Stevens 2

Representative Pat Roberts 2

WITNESSES

William J. Boarman, President, Printing, Publishing and Media Workers of America, AFL-CIO 3

Prepared statement 8

George Lord, Chairman, Joint Council of GPO Unions, U.S. Government Printing Office 7

Prepared statement 11

Hon. Walter J. Stewart, Secretary, U.S. Senate 20

Prepared statement 24

Hon. Donnald K. Anderson, Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives 23

Prepared statement 26

Lewis L. Small, Inspector General; accompanied by John Lopez, Acting Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, U.S. Government Printing Office 36

Prepared statement 37

Response to written questions of Senator Glenn 69

Hon. Robert W. Houk, Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office 46

Prepared statement 50

Response to written questions of:

Senator Stevens 32

Senator Glenn 68

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Action plan submitted by the U.S. Government Printing Office in response to the U.S. General Accounting Office report No. GGD-90-107 70

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1991

U.S. Senate,
Joint Committee on Printing,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Wendell H. Ford (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Ford, Stevens, and Hatfield; Representatives Rose and Roberts.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FORD

The Chairman. The committee will come to order.

Last July, the Joint Committee on Printing began this series of hearings on the Government Printing Office and how it is being run. The General Accounting Office told us that a number of problems existed, including weak managerial techniques, ineffective recordkeeping, waste of paper, manpower and equipment.

Today, we hope to get some additional views on those findings and get an update from the Public Printer on changes he has made. We also hope to focus on the kind of service GPO is providing Congress for the Congressional Record and key bills during peak periods of congressional activity.

It is imperative that Members of Congress have time to review legislative proposals before they must vote on them. Those involved in printing these documents risk doing a great disservice to the Congress and to the American people if they are not accurate and if Members don't have them when they are needed.

We are pleased to have other members on the committee present today. I am very pleased that at our first organizational meeting, Representative Charlie Rose of North Carolina will be the new chairman of the committee. I wish him well and I will be glad to give him the gavel when the time comes. We will be pleased to hear from Representative Rose. If you have any comments or statements to be made this morning, we would entertain them at this time.

Representative Rose. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have a statement. It is a great pleasure to be here with you. I look forward to learning from the hearing this morning and to do the best I can to fill your shoes. That will probably be an impossible task, but we will give it our best shot. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I imagine your size and my size—you will fill them well.

Senator Stevens, do you have a statement to make this morning?

Senator STEVENS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to put my statement in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Senator STEVENS. I join you in welcoming our old friend, Charlie Rose, and you will recognize him as a computer buff, as I say in my statement here. So we are pleased to see that the man who has led the charge in the House in terms of high-tech utilization in our business will become chairman, and I am sure we can work with him very closely.

I would like to just print my statement in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Senator Stevens follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR TED STEVENS

I want to commend Chairman Ford for scheduling this hearing so we can examine the overall operation of Congressional products including the on-time delivery of the Congressional Record. On July 19, 1990, an earlier oversight hearing was held to examine a management review by the General Accounting Office which he had requested earlier in the year. Some problems at the GPO, inherited by the then-new public printer, Bob Houk, had not been examined for over a decade by this Committee. In our oversight role we are required under the law to use any measure we consider necessary to remedy neglect, delay, duplication or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications. Thus these hearings are important in meeting this responsibility.

This hearing is both a follow-up of our July 1990 hearing and an examination of the timeliness of the Congressional products. I intend to revisit these questions and concerns that were raised in July at the appropriate time.

I am pleased to see a fellow computer buff Congressman Charlie Rose as our incoming Chairman. Congressman Rose is legendary in the House for finding innovative ways for making information available to Members. He not only led the charge for cellular telephones and beepers for the Members, he has spent the last decade working to allow Members the ability to buy or rent computers. Though we are reluctant to admit it sometimes we look to the House for leadership on such matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatfield, do you have a statement to make?

Senator HATFIELD. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman, do you have a statement you would like to make this morning?

Representative ROBERTS. No, sir. I have a statement to be inserted in the record at this point, and I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. Your statement will be included in the record as if given.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Roberts follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE PAT ROBERTS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to continue our oversight hearings we began last July. I look forward to hearing from the Public Printer the corrective actions he has taken since July to address the deficiencies pointed out by the GAO Report. Also, what progress he has made in getting the Record on-line.

I commend the Chairman for addressing the lateness of Congressional products during the hectic days at the end of the 101st Congress. It is a problem that has to be solved.

The CHAIRMAN. Our first panel this morning, if they will start coming forward, will be William J. Boarman, President, Printing, Publishing and Media Workers Sector, Communications Workers of

America; and George Lord, Chairman, Joint Council on GPO Unions, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Good morning, gentlemen. The rising stars in the labor union are here. You know, why not? So, who wants to go first? Bill, do you want to go first? You may proceed, and we ask that you be as brief as possible so we might have an opportunity to ask you some questions and we won't prolong the hearing too long this morning.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, PRESIDENT, PRINTING, PUBLISHING AND MEDIA WORKERS SECTOR, COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO; AND GEORGE LORD, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COUNCIL OF GPO UNIONS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE; ACCOMPANIED BY FRED ALLEN, VICE CHAIRMAN, JOINT COUNCIL OF GPO UNIONS, AND GEORGE DRIESEN, COUNSEL

Mr. BOARMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here. If I could, since I am going to be hitting off first, I would like to introduce the folks that are with me today. To my immediate left is Fred Allen, who is the vice chairman of the Joint Council of Unions at the Government Printing Office, and an executive board member of the Graphic Communications International Union. And to my right is George Lord, who is the chairman of the Joint Council of Unions, and who you will be hearing from following my statement. And to his right is Mr. George Driesen, a Washington labor attorney who represents the Joint Council of Unions.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the operation of the Government Printing Office. I especially want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing and the one which preceded it. Too little attention has been paid to the GPO by the Joint Committee over the years, and I would like to believe that this refocused attention marks the beginning of a new era.

The GPO is a vital national institution and a major employer in the Washington area. Hundreds of members of my own union work at the GPO, making its mission and success all that more important to me.

So that you may understand my perspective on this issue, let me point out that I currently serve as president of the Printing, Publishing and Media Workers Sector of the Communications Workers of America, the union which represents printers at the GPO, and has done so virtually since the GPO's founding.

Before taking elective office with my international union, I worked for many years as a printer in the private sector, both in the commercial and newspaper branches of the printing industry. The last place I worked before assuming full-time union duties was, in fact, the GPO. I still hold a position at the GPO and am on a leave of absence while performing my union work.

My concern for the institution goes far beyond that of GPO employee and trade unionist. The GPO provides a service to the citizens of our Nation that is unparalleled. Through the Superintendent of Documents program and the depository library program, the GPO makes available to the American people the stuff that feeds our very heart and soul of our democratic system—information.

What is truly under discussion here, I believe, is the very existence of the GPO. I believe that if Congress does not fight for its survival, the GPO will pass and the American people and Congress will have lost a service that they have enjoyed and relied upon for more than 100 years.

Does the GPO have problems? Of course, it does. Does the GPO merit criticism? Of course, it does, if the criticism is constructive. But the General Accounting Office report approaches the issue from a perspective that, because the GPO is a monopoly, it has outlived its usefulness. The report's title makes that view and determination quite clear—quote, "Monopoly-Like Status Contributes to Inefficiency and Ineffectiveness," end of quote.

I would suggest that there is a basic flaw in that assessment; that what is termed GPO's monopoly-like status is not the cause of whatever ails the agency. I would suggest that the cure to what ails the GPO can be found not in decentralizing GPO, but rather in treating it more as the major and vital business that it is.

I would suggest we do that in two primary ways: First, we treat the GPO as we would treat any other billion-dollar-a-year business, in that we pay more attention to its oversight. That means that as overworked as the Members of the Congress who serve on this Joint Committee are, a way must be found to devote more attention to the GPO.

I noted a minute ago how pleased I am at the opportunity to appear before you today and how pleased I was that this is the second such hearing within a span of just a few months. I submit that it would serve the GPO and the Nation itself well if the Joint Committee could routinely meet at least twice a year to focus on how the GPO can improve its service to its clients.

Likewise, I believe the House Administration and Senate Rules Committees, which have direct responsibility for GPO under Title 44, could benefit by focusing more attention on the selection and confirmation process of the Public Printer. Once a Public Printer is nominated by the President, if confirmed, he or she works for you, the Joint Committee on Printing, that has powers comparable to a board of directors.

There is nothing more critical to a corporation than to have a competent CEO at its helm, and the GPO is no different. Just as the board of directors at the big three auto makers insist on chief executives with deep backgrounds in the auto industry and insist on chief executives with whom they can build and maintain a close working relationship, so it must be at the GPO.

We are fortunate today that the current Public Printer seems to be well qualified for the post. The same cannot be said of his predecessors over the past two administrations. In other words, GPO has not had a competent leader for more than a decade.

Just as Congress must assure that the President's nominee for Public Printer is qualified to undertake the job, so too must the Joint Committee assure itself that its own staff has a like level of background and expertise in the industry. It is vitally important that the committee's top staff be equipped, as the Public Printer himself is, to deal with the sweeping range of technical and other problems and concerns that arise in the rapidly evolving world of printing and data communication.

As I noted earlier, I have another major concern with the GAO's condemnation of GPO's monopoly-like status. We all know that many government agencies would prefer to handle their own printing directly, not going through the GPO. We must remember why the GPO was established, to remove from the process of government printing the elements of graft, bribery and bias. Further cripple or kill off the GPO and you will face the ugly recurrence of those ills and the concomitant proliferation of unnecessary publications created to feed the maw of the Executive Branch pork barrel.

I want to give you my thoughts on some of the specifics of the GAO report. I see a real apples-and-oranges element in the GAO analysis of GPO's problem when it discusses the GPO and the private sector alternatives.

We must remember that the GPO is set up for short-run, short-turnaround jobs like the Congressional Record, the Federal Register, legislation, and the like. The mechanical requirements for such jobs and billing procedures are totally different from those involving production of pamphlets, booklets, and other less time-certain printing jobs.

If Congress wants to deal with other agency work, but at lower cost than is incurred today, it must agree to the use of additional staff and additional equipment. These are policy decisions. If the decision is to have GPO continue doing short-turnaround, short-run work for the President and the Congress, then the plant must be kept state of the art.

There has been a hiring ceiling at the GPO for a number of years, and that has now affected the GPO's ability to process the incredible 1,300 orders that come through that office daily. Multiply that by the number of work days in a year, weigh the workload against the relatively few customer complaints that are registered and the timeliness of delivery of such staples as the Record and the Register, and you see that GPO, in fact, does a yeoman job, especially when you factor in the aged physical plant and the understaffing that are a matter of record.

If the GPO is allowed to decline further, it would cost an incredible amount of money to put it back together. We don't want to further weaken the GPO, but to strengthen it. For Congress and the American people to be well served, we need an improved, modernized physical plant. The newest GPO building is 40 years old. When the GAO speaks of waste and inefficiency at the GPO, it must consider where some of this waste and inefficiency comes from—not from the uncaring and careless staff, but from the very physical construct of the plant. For example, modern printing plants are essentially one-floor affairs, or at least are constructed so that huge rolls or pallets of paper must not be moved from floor to floor, with the inevitable accompanying damage to the stock.

We do need better management skills at the GPO. There has been little in the way of hiring at the GPO for many years now, and the agency has lost its ability to attract outside talent—outside talent that has been exposed to and is prepared to be innovative with the new technologies.

In the past, GPO could attract highly qualified private sector people who would join the agency and rise through the ranks to positions of authority. Retirements in recent years have drained a tremendous amount of management and craft skills. We must make an investment in the GPO and attract the leadership it needs.

Additionally, I respectfully suggest that this committee examine ways it can devote more attention to the GPO on an ongoing basis. Because of the very nature of our system of government, the people who lead this committee have countless other pressing demands on their time and responsibilities that in the real order of things draw their attention from the concerns facing us here today.

Treading as lightly as I can in this area, let me ask that the committee consider some way in which perhaps a more junior member who, by definition, has fewer demands on his or her time might be put in a position of pro tem leadership for the purpose of conducting hearings, dealing with the staff, and doing other committee business.

The GAO report of September 26, 1990, makes several concrete recommendations, as summarized on page 7 of the executive summary. While I cover those in some detail in this statement, I would just like to focus briefly on those recommendations.

The GAO recommends that the Joint Committee take the lead in convening a group that would include the Public Printer, Congress, Federal Agencies, the GPO unions, and others to decide the future role and mission of GPO. Within the framework of an improved strategic planning process, this group should answer the critical questions concerning GPO's future role in government printing. Once that future role has been determined, action should be initiated to staff and equip GPO to carry out that role. Regardless of the outcome of any future role discussions, GPO needs to correct its operational problems.

Let me point out that while I will accept the recommendation, I served on one of these committees a number of years ago and it didn't work. I was president of the printers local union at GPO at the time. We met, discussed, weighed problems. Transcripts were prepared, a report was written, and legislation was drafted that had a lot of support from committee members, and it died in Congress. Largely, it was an exercise in futility.

More effective, I believe, would be for this committee to take advantage of the broad powers granted to it under Title 44 of the United States Code. If this committee doesn't take the proverbial bull by its proverbial horns, what needs to be done at the GPO simply will not be done.

What is at stake here ultimately is too important to stray far from your control. What is at stake in the survival and strengthening of GPO is, in fact, who will control the access to information by the American people. Will private industry or will government? Unless this committee acts to defend the GPO as the government's central printing and information operation, the very stuff which democracy is made of will be at risk.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my remarks today and I would be very happy to answer any questions by you or the members of your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Boarman. We will hear from Mr. Lord before we get to the questioning and then we will question both of you.

Mr. Lord.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE LORD

Mr. Lord. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say it is indeed a pleasure for me and my colleagues to be here before you today, and we certainly appreciate——

The Chairman. Just wait until after you get through with the questions before you say it is a pleasure.

Mr. Lord. Well, my experience is that you do that up front and then take your lumps as they come.

The Chairman. OK.

Mr. Lord. I will summarize our remarks and, of course, our testimony is in full for the record.

The Chairman. It will be included in the record in full.

Mr. Lord. Thank you.

The Joint Council of GPO Unions agrees with several key recommendations of the recent GAO report. We agree that GPO must assign high priority to satisfying the needs of Congress and the agencies which it serves, but we know from our own experience that it does.

We also agree that the GPO has been plagued by a lack of top-level support for strategic planning and are ready to participate in the planning as GAO suggested. We agree, and have in the past repeatedly expressed our view to Congress that GPO has too many mid-level administrative employees. We most emphatically agree with the GAO that Congress' failure to act promptly and favorably upon GPO's requests for new capital investment is driving up GPO's costs and interfering with the efficient performance of its work.

We emphatically disagree with several of GAO's other observations and conclusions. The notion that competition would make GPO more efficient is based upon either ideology and not analysis. GPO does compete. Between 75 and 83 percent of the government's printing is performed by private printers based upon competitive prices.

Furthermore, competition will not enable GPO to procure new machinery and equipment or hire the additional production workers it needs in order to cut costs and improve turnaround time. Allowing individual agencies to siphon off certain jobs and contract them out themselves will increase, not reduce, the government's overall printing costs.

The GAO's offhand and unsupported claim that GPO wages exceed those in the private sector by 50 percent casts doubt on the credibility of the rest of this report. It is simply wrong. GPO employees' 37.5 work week is consistent with the work week in the organizing printing industry, which ranges from 35 hours to 37.5 hours per week. The reduction from 40 to 37.5 hours GPO negotiated a few years ago was exchanged for a lower wage increase.

GAO vastly exaggerates the savings that might be garnered by greater attention to scheduling. GAO assumed that Congress' demand for fast turnaround means the only work that should be performed on weekend overtime is congressional printing, but giving preference to congressional printing often means that longdeferred or time-sensitive agency printing must be performed on weekends. Hence, the premise of the GAO study is faulty.

In addition, for reasons explained in the body of my remarks, the GAO study is flawed with methodological reason. Finally, GAO ignores the fact that overtime is endemic in the printing industry because of the peaks and valleys and nature of the demand. In sum, we believe the GAO report contains some serious errors and distorts some facts through an ideological prism. We nevertheless agree with certain of its recommendations and stand ready and willing to cooperate to implement them.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statements of Mr. Boarman and Mr. Lord follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. BOARMAN

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Joint Committee on Printing, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the operation of the Government Printing Office. I especially want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing and the one which preceded it. Too little attention has been paid the GPO by the Joint Committee over the years, and I would like to believe this refocused attention marks the beginning of a new era.

The GPO is a vital national institution and a major employer in the Washington area. Hundreds of members of my own union work at the GPO, making its mission and success all that more important to me.

So that you may understand my perspective on the issue, let me point out that I currently serve as president of the Printing, Publishing and Media Workers Sector of the Communications Workers of America, the union which represents printers at the GPO and has done so virtually since " the GPO's founding. I also am an international vice president and executive board member of the CWA.

Before taking elective office with my international union I worked for many years as a printer in both the commercial and newspaper branches of the printing industry. The last place I worked before assuming full-time duties with my union was, in fact, the GPO. I still hold a position at the GPO, and am on a leave of absence while I perform my union work.

My concern for the institution goes far beyond that of GPO employee and trade unionist. The GPO provides a service to the citizens of our nation that is unparalleled. Through the Superintendent of Documents program and the depository library program, the GPO makes available to the American people the stuff that feeds the very heart and soul of our democratic system—information.

I ask for your indulgence today in that I want to talk with you not solely on the narrow issue of delivery problems—problems that I do address later in my testimony—but on the broader issues raised at your earlier hearings.

What is truly under discussion here, I believe, is the very existence of the GPO. I believe that if Congress does not fight for its survival, the GPO will pass and the American people will have lost a service they have enjoyed and relied upon for more than one hundred years.

Does the GPO have problems? Of course it does. Does the GPO merit criticism? Of course if does—if the criticism is constructive. But the General Accounting Office report approaches the issue from the perspective that because the GPO is a monopoly, it has outlived its usefulness. The report's title makes that view and determination quite clear: "Monopoly-Like Status Contributes to Inefficiency and Ineffectiveness."

I would suggest that there is a basic flaw in that assessment, that what is termed GPO's monopoly-like status is not the cause of whatever ails the agency. I would suggest that the cure to what ails the GPO can be found not in decentralizing GPO but rather in treating it more as the major and vital business it is.

I would suggest we do that in two primary ways.

First, we treat the GPO as we would treat any other billion-dollar-a-year business in that we pay more attention to its oversight. That means that as overworked as are the members of Congress who serve on this joint committee, a way must be found to devote more attention to the GPO.

I noted a minute ago how pleased I was at the opportunity to appear before you today, and how pleased I was that this is the second such hearing within the span of just a few months. I submit that it would serve the GPO and the nation itself well if the joint committee could routinely meet at least twice a year to focus on how the GPO can improve its service to its clients.

Likewise, I believe the House Administration and Senate Rules Committees, which have direct responsibility for the GPO under Title 44, could benefit by focusing more attention on the selection and confirmation process for the Public Printer. Once the Public Printer is nominated by the President, if confirmed he or she works for you, the Joint Committee on Printing, a legislative agency that has powers comparable to a corporate board of directors.

There is nothing more critical to a corporation than to have a competent CEO at its helm, and the GPO is no different. Just as the boards of directors at the Big Three automakers insist on chief executives with deep backgrounds in the auto industry, and insist on chief executives with whom they can build and maintain a close working relationship, so it must be at the GPO. We are fortunate today in that the current Public Printer seems to be well qualified for the post. The same cannot be said of some of his predecessors over the past two administrations.

Just as Congress must assure that the President's nominee for Public Printer is qualified to undertake the job, so too must this Joint Committee assure itself that its own staff has a like level of background and expertise in the industry. It is vitally important that the Committee's top staff be as equipped as the Public Printer himself to deal with the sweeping range of technical and other problems and concerns that arise in the rapidly-evolving world of printing and data communication.

As I noted earlier, I have another major concern with the GAO's condemnation of the GPO's "Monopoly-Like Status."

The reality is that an improved, more efficient and responsive GPO is the last thing the private sector printing industry wants. Basic economics will make that clearer than I ever could. Why would these forces be interested in a more effective, efficient GPO when, to date, they enjoy $600 or $700 million a year in subcontracted GPO work?

These elements, and their supporters at all levels of government, do not want an improved GPO. They want the GPO demolished, so that they may pick up even *more* of the government's printing work.

Likewise, we all know that many government agencies would prefer to handle their own printing directly, not going through the GPO. We must remember why the GPO was established: to remove from the process of government printing the elements of graft, bribery and bias. Further cripple or kill off the GPO and you face the ugly recurrence of those ills, with a concomitant proliferation of unnecessary publications created to feed the maw of the executive branch pork barrel.

I want to give my thoughts on some of the specifics of the GAO report in the hope I can shed some light on the problems we all see, and help arrive at some workable solutions.

I see a real "apples vs. oranges" element in the GAO analysis of GPO's problems when it discusses the GPO and the private sector alternatives.

We must remember that the GPO was set up for short run, short turnaround jobs like the Congressional Record, the Federal Register, legislation and the like. The mechanical requirements for such jobs and billing procedures are totally different from those involving production of pamphlets, booklets and other less time-certain printing jobs.

A commercial printer can take such a job, assure delivery within 30 days, and fit it in to his existing workload. The GPO, however, must fit the job in to its basic quick turnaround schedule and basic operational game plan.

If Congress wants GPO to deal with other agency work, but at a lower cost than is incurred today, it must agree to the use of additional staff and additional equipment. These are policy decisions. If the decision is to have GPO continue doing short turnaround, short-run work for the President and Congress, then the plant must be kept state of the art. There has been a hiring ceiling at the GPO for a number of years now that has affected the GPO's ability to process the incredible 1,300 orders that come through the office daily. Multiply that by the number of workdays in a year, weigh the workload against the relatively few customer complaints that are registered and the timeliness of delivery of such staples as the Record and the Register, and you see that the GPO in fact does a yeoman job. Especially when you factor in the aged physical plant and understaffing that are a matter of record.

If the GPO is allowed to decline further, it would cost an incalculable amount of money to put it back together. We don't want to further weaken the GPO, but to strengthen it.

For Congress and the American people to be well-served, we need an improved, modernized physical plant. The newest GPO building is 40 years old. When the GAO speaks of waste and inefficiency at the GPO, it must consider where some of that waste and inefficiency comes from: not from an uncaring and careless staff, but from the very physical construct of the plant. For example, modern printing plants are essentially one-floor affairs, or at least are constructed so that huge rolls or pallets of paper must not be moved from floor to floor, with the inevitable accompanying damage to the stock. Going back to my analogy with the Big Three automakers, let me ask, rhetorically, how worse a shape the U.S. auto industry would be in today if it last retooled 40 years ago.

Just as our equipment has aged, so has our workforce. As we bring in new equipment, we must be prepared to do the kind of retraining and skills upgrading necessary to keep our workforce up to par as well. This has worked well in the past, but it must be made to work today and in the future as well. We need better management skills at the GPO. There has been little in the way of hiring at the GPO for many years now, and the agency has lost its ability to attract outside talent—outside talent that has been exposed to, and is prepared to be innovative with, the new technologies. In the past, the GPO could attract highly qualified private sector people who would join the agency and rise through the ranks to positions of authority. Retirements in recent years have drained a tremendous amount of management and craft skills. We must make an investment in the GPO and attract the leadership it needs.

Additionally, I respectfully suggest that this committee examine ways it can devote more attention to the GPO on an ongoing basis. Because of the very nature of our system of government, the people who lead this committee have countless other pressing demands on their time and responsibilities that, in the real order of things, draw their attention from the concerns facing us here today. Treading as lightly as I can in this area, let me ask that the committee consider some way in which, perhaps, a more junior member, who by definition has fewer demands on his or her time, might be put in a position of pro tem leadership for the purpose of conducting hearings, dealing with staff and doing other committee business. Likewise, I can't help but think it would be positive if there were some way in which senior-most staff could be charged with the responsibility of day-to-day contact with the Public Printer.

The GAO report of September 26, 1990 makes several concrete recommendations, as summarized on page 7 of the Executive Summary. Let me comment briefly on each.

> "To address the operational problems in GPO operations, GAO recommends that the Public Printer improve scheduling of work in the central plant so that most work is done during the week, thereby reducing weekend overtime significantly and decreasing idle machine time."

I would say that the concept offered is fine, except that the findings really did not clearly identify why overtime is actually worked on weekends. The reality of government printing is that if agencies or Congress send work in on Friday or Saturday or Sunday and ask for its completion and delivery by Monday morning, then the work is scheduled, regardless of whether staff were idle during the preceding week, or may be in the following week. The GPO must produce the work when the customer wants it. Overtime at GPO is not created because of the nature of GPO; rather, it is created because of the demands of its clientele.

> "GAO recommends that the Public Printer establish goals and take action to reduce waste and spoilage."

As I noted earlier, the physical plant layout is a major culprit here. An investment in the physical plant would have a substantial, positive impact in the area of waste and spoilage.

> "GAO recommends that the Public Printer adopt a comprehensive quality management strategy."

I support that effort, with the caveat that the strategy not be based on adverse treatment of the GPO's workforce.

> "GAO recommends that the Public Printer improve the information on contractor performance and issue guidance on how to best use that information in awarding contracts."

I certainly support this recommendation. It appears from reading the GAO report that, based on prior performance, many subcontracts and subcontractors simply should not be in the pipeline. I would support cleaning this up. After all, if the GAO says our costs are so much higher than those of the subcontractors, and this group includes a large number of inefficient vendors, then the clear message is that they do it cheap and they do it bad.

> "GAO recommends that the Public Printer provide more information on customers' bills, furnish accurate and timely information on the status of work, obtain and analyze customer feedback, and improve complaint resolution."

I support the recommendation. It's clearly sound business practice.

> "GAO recommends that the Public Printer improve the system for measuring managers' performance by strengthening the performance plans." Also, "Overhaul the Executive Information System and improve its timeliness and usefulness to top managers."

I support the recommendations, but caution that such support is not meant to infer agreement with the overall GAO report. A number of problems surfaced at the GPO simply are not dealt with in the recommendations. In fact, some appear studiously avoided.

Finally, the GAO recommends that the Joint Committee "take the lead in convening a group that would include the Public Printer, Congress, federal agencies, the GPO unions, and others to decide the future role and mission of GPO. Within the framework of an improved strategic planning process, this group should answer the critical questions concerning GPO's future role in government printing. Once that future role has been determined, actions should be initiated to staff and equip GPO to carry out that role. Regardless of the outcome of any future role discussions, GPO needs to correct its operational problems."

Let me point out that while I will accept the recommendation, I served on one of these committees a number of years ago . . . and it didn't work. I was president of the printers local union at GPO at the time. We met, discussed, weighed options, transcripts were prepared, a report was written and legislation was drafted that had a lot of support from committee members . . . and it died in Congress. Largely, it was an exercise in futility.

More effective, I believe, would be for this committee to take advantage of the broad powers granted it under Title 44 of the U.S. Code. If this committee doesn't take the proverbial bull by its proverbial horns, what needs to be done at the GPO simply will not be done.

What is at stake here, ultimately, is too important to stray far from your control. What is at stake in the survival and strengthening of the GPO is, in fact, who will control the access to information by the American people. Will private industry, or will government? Unless this committee acts to defend the GPO as the government's central printing and information operation, the very stuff of which democracy is made will be at risk.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my remarks today. I would be happy to answer any questions you or your fellow committee members may have.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE LORD

The Joint Council of GPO Unions agrees with several key recommendations of the recent GAO Report to the Joint Committee on Printing. Of course GPO must, as it does, assign a top priority to satisfying the needs of the Congress and the agencies which it serves. Of course, GPO has been plagued by a lack of top level support for strategic planning, as GAO pointed out. If the Joint Committee on Printing were to invite us to participate in formulating a strategic plan for the Office, as the GAO recommends, we will be happy to participate. We agree that GPO has too many administrative employees.

Most of all, we agree emphatically with the GAO's recommendation that the Joint Committee on Printing act upon and approve the requests for new machinery and equipment that have been pending before it for many years and that Congress expedite the capital investment approval process—which now takes two years even in the best of circumstances. The equipment that GPO has sought to replace is obsolete and/or worn out. Indeed, we are using presses to print the Congressional Record that are over forty years old!

Worn out and obsolete equipment means poorer quality work. It also means wasted manpower (which translates into dollars) and schedule delays when equipment breaks down or presses go out of alignment in the middle of a job. Stopping the presses in order to print a late breaking item is one thing; stopping the presses because they have gone out of registration or because a critical piece of equipment has failed in the middle of a production run, events that occur daily at GPO, is another matter altogether. Those interruptions mean that whole crews are idle. Finally, inadequate equipment has forced GPO to contract out jobs with long press runs, precisely the jobs that have the lowest unit cost, thus driving up its "prices" for work done in house. And new equipment would mean an even smaller work force. Failure to respond to the Public Printer's requests for new machinery and equipment (which, be it remembered, "competition" cannot procure for the Office) is thus a key stumbling block to making GPO more efficient. It is a classic example of penny wise and pound foolish.

Despite our agreement with these facets of the Report, we profoundly disagree with the ideologically driven conclusion that GPO's problems reflect its "monopoly" position and an absence of competition. We also believe that the GAO's casual and unsupported statement about GPO wages is so wide of the mark as to cast doubt on the quality of the study.

Finally, the Report's claim that GPO employees work excessive overtime that could be avoided by better "scheduling" ignores the facts of life both in the printing industry generally and at GPO—in particular. In both, overtime is a way of life precisely—because printing is a "peaks and valleys" business. We discuss these aspects of the Report below.

First, GPO is in competition. Over 75% [1] of the Government's printing (measured in dollars) is procured, based largely upon comparative costs, from GPO's "competitors" in the private sector. Furthermore, the proposition that "competition" would make GPO more efficient overlooks the profound differences between GPO and private printers. Competition will not enable GPO to purchase modern equipment and to hire and train new employees who are needed to improve GPO's performance. GPO's capital and manpower acquisitions are largely outside the control of GPO's managers, including the JCP. Nor will more competition reduce the idle time of aged and obsolete GPO machinery, and diminish overtime.

Comparing the unit prices the government pays to outside vendors with the "prices" GPO charges government agencies and Congress treats apples as if they were oranges. GPO's charges are intra-governmental bookkeeping entries; prices paid to vendors are real costs to the government. Beyond that, GPO is the Government's printer of last resort. Often, it contracts out high volume work that has a low unit cost while keeping the short production runs, that have very high unit costs, in house precisely because private companies will only perform those jobs at high prices, whereas GPO averages them in its total operating picture to arrive at its largely uniform, intragovernmental "prices." At the same time, GPO charges the same "price" to Congress, a demand, high cost, priority customer whose needs require a great deal of machinery that can be put to use instantly as the work comes in, as GPO charges to agencies whose work may be scheduled in more rational and economic matter. That policy tends to push up GPO's "prices."

At all events, the work GPO does for agencies and the Executive Branch drives down the unit cost of Congressional printing, which cannot realistically be procured elsewhere. Hence, arguing that GPO should be judged by the "prices" it "charges" for particular jobs and punished for not being "competitive" is a product of ideology, not analysis. "Competition" will simply increase the cost of printing congressional work, thus increasing the government wide cost of printing.

Presumably, the Report contemplates that if an agency can procure work at lower prices than GPO charges, the agency would be free to do so. The high cost and corruption that accompanied uncontrolled agency contracting led the Congress to create the GPO in the first instance. Furthermore, it looks at the problem from the wrong end of the telescope: from the vantage point of each individual agency, which may in certain instances reduce the charges to its appropriation by bypassing GPO. But the cumulative effect would be to lessen GPO's leverage with the private sector and leave GPO's equipment and manpower idle more of the time. As a result, other agencies and the Congress would more than pay for the savings the contracting agency realized, savings that could prove temporary once the market effect of GPO's competition were reduced or eliminated. Only the private printing industry would benefit from this state of affairs over the long run.[2]

---

[1] Office of Technology Assessment, *Informing the Nation*, p. 75 (1988). The figure is for fiscal year 1987. More recent data indicates the figure is closer to 83% now.

We are appalled that GAO would issue a "report" that relies on an anonymous GPO source for the proposition that GPO wages are 50% higher than those paid similarly situated employees in the private sector. The assertion is simply wrong. Wage comparison is a highly complicated, technical matter, not susceptible to facile, off-hand analysis. When a Fact Finder selected by this Committee took testimony on comparative wages in a vigorously contested proceeding in which both GPO and the Joint Bargaining Committee of GPO Unions were represented by professionals and presented expert testimony, he concluded that . . . GPO employees are neither significantly ahead nor do they lag behind their private sector counterparts; they are in a generally equivalent position." This is not the place to set out comparative wages. Suffice it to say that GAO's remark is unsupported and unsupportable.

Nor is it surprising that GPO employees, in effect, work a 37½ hour week. In the organized printing industry 35-37½ hour work weeks are the norm. (The Washington Post, for example works a 35 hour work week). When the parties negotiated a collective bargaining agreement providing for a paid lunch hour, the cost of that change was the consideration for the unions' agreement to a lower wage increase than they would otherwise have accepted.

GAO is simply not equipped,[3] and in this study, did not undertake, to compare GPO and comparable private sector compensation. Any serious study of that matter requires professional representation of both sides. Relying on the unilateral assertion of a GPO employee is simply an inadequate basis for making a statement on a subject as complex as wage comparability.

The GAO's discussion of overtime at GPO is flawed by the unfamiliarity of the report writers with the printing industry in general and GPO in particular. Overtime is endemic in the printing industry. Inevitably, because printing, especially demand printing like much of the work that GPO does, is a peaks and valleys business. GAO seemed to imagine that the only reason GPO calls upon workers to put in overtime is when Congressional work demands it. But not infrequently, because the Office necessarily gives Congressional work a high priority, GPO defers agency work that has a longer lead time until the last minute, when it must be performed on overtime. Thus, Congressional demands may force GPO to work weekends on agency as well as Congressional printing. Furthermore, equipment failures force GPO to ask production workers to work outside their scheduled work week. Finally, GPO's production force has been drastically reduced. In 1979 we had 3,471 production workers; now we have 1,860. Some of that drop reflects the introduction of labor saving equipment, but much of it stems from the Congress' refusal to permit GPO to hire and train new production workers. The result is a shortage of production workers who are forced to work overtime in order to get the work out.

The GAO overtime study is also methodologically flawed. It looked only at weekend overtime. But the pressures described above force workers to stay on the job after their shifts are over, thus increasing GPO's overtime costs. Furthermore, GAO reports the number of weekend days when overtime was performed, thus treating the overtime problem as the same whether one person (or one crew) worked for four hours on Saturday or half the production force worked all day.

Nor does machine down time during the week necessarily suggest that better scheduling would eliminate weekend overtime.

Machines are not fungible. If a large web press is needed during the week and on the weekend, idle time on a letterpress cannot, by better scheduling, solve the problem. For all these reasons, we think GAO has exaggerated the extent to which better scheduling would reduce overtime. Few of the workers we represent are pleased about the overtime they are asked to perform: they feel overworked on account of it. But only GAO imagines that GPO managers carelessly schedule work on weekends that could have been performed during the week. The facts of our industrial life—skimping on equipment, refusing to permit new hires, and the "peaks and valleys" nature of the printing business—are the principal determinants of overtime.

---

[2] We note that GAO assumes that GPO's procurement operation is ineffective. The Office of Technology Assessment, which studied government printing for a much longer period and from a government-wide perspective, came to the opposite conclusion. See *Informing the Nation, supra*, pp. 12, 283-286. OTA compared the cost of sample printing jobs procured by GPO and by federal agencies. OTA concluded that "GPO-produced printing is less expensive than or at least competitive with printing obtained by individual agencies directly from private printers." *Id.* at p. 283.

[3] GAO has previously published one-sided and ill considered comparisons of GPO wages. Typically, GAO asks the Joint Bargaining Committee for its "input," but that group is composed entirely of GPO workers and cannot, in response to a GAO inquiry, employ professionals to compile data that is essential to present the Joint Bargaining Committee's position. Comparability studies in the government are usually performed by professionals representing management and employees. See, *e.g.*, 5 USCS § 5301, *et seq.* (1980) (Pay Comparability System); *id* § 5305 (b) (providing for Federal Employees' Pay Council composed of representatives of labor organizations). That practice reflects Congressional recognition that without vigorous and technically skilled representation of employees, the Government cannot be expected fairly to compare wages.

Summarizing, we believe that the GAO report contains glaring errors and distorts the facts through an ideological prism. Nevertheless, we agree with many of its recommendations and are prepared to cooperate fully in implementing those. We would welcome the opportunity to participate in any effort that could improve GPO's performance and efficiency.

Very truly yours,

Joint Council of Unions,
Government Printing Office.
GEORGE LORD, *Chairman.*

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lord. I will forego questions of these two gentlemen and ask Congressman Rose if he has any questions he would like to ask.

Representative ROSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to take up a lot of the committee's time on my first visit here, but I would like to ask Mr. Boarman—your comments about the old legislation that never went anywhere—is that packet still relevant today? Do we need to go back and look at it or does it need to be totally updated?

Mr. BOARMAN. I think some of it would be relevant, Mr. Chairman. I think that some of it would have to be updated, but there is a lot of work that was done. I would assume that the transcripts are still there.

Representative ROSE. How long ago was this?

Mr. BOARMAN. About 10 years, I believe. There was a bill drafted and introduced in your committee. It passed out of committee and was moving to the floor and then it died there.

Representative ROSE. The last thing I wanted to say was I am a little—being very new at this, very interested at your comment about the future role of the GPO. I certainly envision a very strong role for the GPO and would like to explore at a later time with all of you just where that is going.

The whole question of who will control access to information is a question of vital interest to me and, I think, should be to the Congress, and the fact that we need to make sure that the public has access to ever-increasing amounts of information at lower cost rather than having more difficulty to access that information. I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Lord, at some point I hope to get very familiar with your comments about the need to spend more money to upgrade the plant. Is it your opinion that this applies not only to the buildings, as Mr. Boarman mentioned—the physical plant itself—but the presses and the equipment in them? Is it all the equipment that is in a pretty old state of repair?

Mr. LORD. The important types of equipment, yes, and it is generally—I am primarily addressing the presses that operate mostly for Congress. So the equipment is well older than what private industry normally keeps their equipment based on the questions I have asked people in the private sector.

Representative ROSE. I look forward to working with both of you, and my staff and I will be in touch with you very soon as we start that process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman. Senator Stevens.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I don't have any questions, really. It may turn into a question, but I would hope that you would stay and listen to the Secretary of the Senate and the statement that he is going to make. I have read it with great interest and with knowledge of some of the problems that ensued from the delays that he mentions, and it seems to me that when both management and labor representatives appear before us, they fail to address the problems that we hear from the membership.

Our membership is concerned with the delivery of materials to keep us in business, and when we have to delay the closing days of the Senate because we cannot get the documents which we naturally demand the right to observe before we finally pass them, I think that the functioning of the GPO is not serving its basic customer, which is the Congress.

Have you gentlemen any comment to make on that statement, or would you like to wait to hear Mr. Stewart's statement?

Mr. BOARMAN. Senator Stevens, I look forward to hearing the Secretary of the Senate's comments and to see what hopefully constructive criticism he has of the agency so that we can work with the Public Printer to improve in those areas.

But I do think that my statement did touch on what I think are some of the problems that you are faced with, and that is an aging physical plant and equipment that is not up to speed. The Congressional Record press, which is the press that is used to print the Congressional Record, is probably held together with baling wire and Scotch tape. It has been there for a long, long time and it really needs to be replaced. And I would invite the members to visit the facility at some time, as Senator Ford did with me a couple of years ago, to see this firsthand.

The photocomposition equipment is state of the art. It probably needs a new-generation input at this point, but it is pretty much on line with what you will find in other printing operations. But I think the press equipment really needs some looking at, and I think the building facilities have had a tremendous impact.

When we have that kind of demand when Congress is in, such as the budget discussions that went on last fall, constantly moving paper around that building is a major problem for the work force and for the agency. I don't know of any other printing plant that comes close to the size of GPO that has that kind of physical constraint problem. They have dealt with it, they will continue to deal with it, but it is going to have an effect, I think, on the overall delivery process that you are concerned with.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

Mr. LORD. If I might add, Senator, I have many examples that I could draw to you, but I will just use one. With the attrition rate that has gone on within GPO since the midseventies, the area which I come from, my craft, which is the plate room, in 1983 was merged with the photo-polymer section which makes the plates for the Congressional Record.

You have got 66 journeymen on 3 shifts right now today, and 22 of them will be eligible to retire in 1991 or 1992, OK? That is one-third of your work force. We have now got the Congressional Record to produce; the bills come in with offset printing. We don't have the manpower anymore to do both at the same time.

When the Record pages come down, the negatives, we have to pull the people out of offset printing that normally do all the hot bills, et cetera, et cetera, that go offset and put them over into photo-polymer to do the Record. Once the Record is done, they will pull them back and put them back into offset to do the bills.

This situation is throughout the production department of GPO, and if you believe those are alarming figures, OTA reported in 1988—and this is Mr. Boarman's area in electronic printing—that as of 1988, 13 percent of all your workers at GPO—this is agency-wide—are eligible for retirement at that given time. Thirty-five percent of your work force had 21 or more years of federal service already at that time. EPD—32 percent of their workers at that time were eligible to retire. Sixty percent of your workers had 21 years' or more federal service. And there has been a hiring freeze.

I don't understand how we can possibly—and believe you me, Senator—you and I have had conversations. I agree with you, the day we stop servicing Congress is the day we might as well fold up and go home. But how can we do it if we don't have the tools to do the job, and how can we complete our mission if we don't have the manpower to complete it?

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. We will talk about it later.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to ask if you gentlemen would prioritize or put in a listing of one, two, three the top priorities of achieving these goals that I think we share. And I assume that when you talk about equipment, you are talking about construction to house that equipment as well. Am I not correct on that?

Mr. LORD. In most likelihood, yes, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. The facilities now are not adequate to house the modern equipment that you are calling for?

Mr. LORD. Well, it is adequate, but you understand that they will be running the old presses until the other ones get on line, which means you have to find another area for the new presses to go, and that means gutting out, probably, an area and reconstructing.

Senator HATFIELD. But I think in your testimony you mentioned about having all the equipment on one level as against a multi-storage structure, so that consequently we are, in effect, talking about housing of the equipment as well as the equipment. Is that correct?

Mr. LORD. That is correct.

Senator HATFIELD. Well, would you set in priority for me, at least, what you consider to be the most important action to take first, second, third to achieve the long-term goals and the short-term goals?

Mr. BOARMAN. Senator, because of the long-range commitment that would have to be made for a new building—and if you ordered a press today, it would probably take 2 years before you get it—I would think that focusing on the staffing, because I think Chairman Lord has outlined what is going to happen over the next year or two because of retirement—and that has been going on; I point that out in my complete statement.

I think that we are at a critical stage of understaffing, and that needs to be focused. There has been authority, I think, to hire 40 additional proofreaders, and that process is going on and I am sure the Public Printer will tell us about that. But there is an area of critical concern where you have an aging work force that has been retiring in great numbers and they haven't been replaced.

And when the Record comes in the pages and the numbers that it does when Congress decides to stay in for a couple of days or longer, it is just almost impossible for them to do more than they are doing. I mean, these people are working around the clock. Everybody will stay and work overtime, if they are asked, to get the Record out.

I mean, I worked there and I know the commitment of these people. They won't go home if your Record isn't finished. I mean, no one walks out the door; they stay there until it is done because they know how important it is. But there comes a point where, if the Congress talks beyond a certain hour of the night, because of the physical plant, the equipment and the staffing, it is just almost impossible to do more than they are doing. But we will try, and if we can hear some suggestions from someone, let us take a stab at it.

But I would say, in answer to your question, probably, take a look at the staffing and try to get the Appropriations Committee to commit some capital investment for building and equipment down the road. That was done some years ago in the appropriations process and somehow it got—I guess when the budgets got tight, it got stripped out.

The final point I will make is that the appropriations——

Senator HATFIELD. Excuse me. Let me interrupt there. Staffing does have to be based upon some reference to equipment as well. If you are involved with old equipment, as you indicate, your staffing relationship would certainly be far different than if you are involved with modern equipment. So, consequently, we don't want to take on a large, say, personnel increment if we, down the road, are going to put in new equipment that reduces the number of personnel required to operate it. Isn't that correct?

Mr. BOARMAN. That is correct, Senator, but in the front end system where you do have modern equipment for typesetting and for proofreading, I don't think that is going to change drastically in the next few years, and you do have a shortage there. A great number of that work force, which are the people I represent, have retired and continue to retire at great numbers, and that is where I think the hold-up is right now.

Senator HATFIELD. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman Roberts.

Representative ROBERTS. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know the testimony to date has emphasized the oversight responsibility we have, and I, for one, would like to thank you, sir, for your leadership as chairman of the Joint Committee, and also Senator Stevens for his longstanding efforts.

I don't know of any other subcommittee or committee on Capitol Hill that is currently holding hearings in the midst of a war. We are not doing oversight on the farm bill, we are not doing oversight on the Federal budget, et cetera, but we are here to address the challenges that we face. I think that speaks very highly of the chairman and the members of the committee and the staff.

We are going to have an end-of-the-month report, as I understand it, on the equipment that we do need to be proposed or suggested by the GPO as a result of the GAO study. When we receive that report we can certainly combine your recommendations with those of the GAO and see if we can't get up to date.

We have many problems and challenges. I would refer to them as challenges, per se, rather than problems. We have had numerous hearings in the House and Senate on Title 44. These hearings were held to determine whether or not we can go on line with our computer capability in the 102d Congress, which I think would certainly be a real breakthrough in terms of the problems we faced at the end of the session.

While I know that you are very eager to play your part and the Public Printer is, and everybody concerned, the problem at the end of the session was largely self-inflicted. Working with our new chairman of the House Administration Committee, we know on the House side that when we stay in session late, we have all sorts of problems.

We have the postmaster, who will come and say I am sorry, we can't get the mail out. We have the restaurant come and say I am sorry, there is nobody here to serve food. We have the police force, who say now we have all sorts of security problems because of the war. These things ebb and flow.

If the Congress had adjourned on schedule—and I don't make any collective perjuring statement in that regard—we wouldn't have these problems. And we have testimony by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House indicating if we get into a late session like we did this last time, we are going to have these kinds of problems again. I don't know what kind of contingency plans you can arrange under those kinds of extreme circumstances. So I look forward to the steady work of the Joint Committee and the appropriate committees in the House and Senate to continue the oversight that you recommend.

Now, having made my speech, let me ask a question. I understand that your workers are averaging approximately 11,000 keystrokes per hour, and that that is the GPO production standard. I also understand—and I am not trying to make apples and oranges here—that in private industry that standard is much higher. And I would point out that GPO's average wage is about 50 percent more than the area standard, and again I know it is apples and oranges and you have a unique role to play.

I am wondering about the training and the worker productivity that you express pride in. If the 11,000 keystrokes per hour is way below the average, we have got some training problems in terms of our product. Now, am I off base on that, or can you respond to that?

Mr. BOARMAN. I think the 11,000 figure is correct, Congressman Roberts. The wage figure you stated, I think, is incorrect. The keystroke figure was negotiated between the unions and the Government Printing Office a number of years ago and perhaps it needs to be looked at again. But you have to understand what went into that process.

You had a group of compositors, printers, and a large number of minorities that were involved, and the agency and the unions took upon themselves to try to make sure—with the assistance of the Joint Committee, I might say—to make sure that people wouldn't lose their jobs. So people that were normally doing a much different mechanical kind of job were retrained to do photocomposition, and so I think that was taken into consideration.

It is my understanding that a number of the people that have been hired in this limited period of the hiring freeze from the outside are operating at a much higher efficiency, and I think you will see that rise. If the cap on hiring comes off and you can attract people from the private sector and as the older work force retires, you are going to see a much higher average.

Representative ROBERTS. Well, I think I am familiar with that. About 5 or 6 years ago, I went over there and, you know, talked individually with some of the people who were going through the retraining. And I shall never forget one individual who previously had a job involving heavy equipment was sitting there in front of a word processor, and privately I asked him how he was getting along. I don't think his fingers would even fit on the keyboard. He responded, "It is your world, I am just living in it." He was doing the best he could.

At the same time, the GPO gets somebody who is from outside this system. If they enter with skill at about 20,000 keystrokes, the person sitting next to them—that is going to cause a little bit of friction. But we need to upgrade that as fast as we can.

If, in fact, in order to be a proofreader at GPO, you have to have completed an apprenticeship of 4 years to even take the test. Why can't you be a proofreader without the apprenticeship if you can pass the test? I note your comment in terms of the capability of the quality people we need. Is there any way that we can shorten up that apprenticeship period, or am I treading on ice that is too thin?

Mr. BOARMAN. Well, that is the standard that has been set, really, in the private sector for apprenticing in the printing industry. Traditionally, GPO only hires people that have had that background because they like to get a high quality of proofreader.

Representative ROBERTS. Well, I proofread in the early morning in Arizona when I was trying to be the William Alan White of Arizona fresh out of the Marine Corps. I worked as a reporter and worked as a broadcaster, and whatever. I am not sure that is even applicable to this particular case, but if you can pass the test and you are good, you shouldn't have to wait 4 years. We need good people, especially under the contingency plan.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Do any other of you gentlemen have any questions of these gentlemen?

[No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming and we look forward to the next hearing.

We now turn to the issue of congressional products and whether the Government Printing Office is providing the level of service Congress needs. During the closing weeks of the 101st Congress, the demand was higher than it had ever been before. The work force at GPO worked around the clock, but as many as 18 volumes of the Congressional Record were not on members' desks the following day. Several parts of the Record did not turn up for 8 or 9 days.

The customers for GPO in this case are the Secretary of the Senate, Joe Stewart, and Clerk of the House, Don Anderson, and if Secretary Stewart and Clerk Anderson will come forward, we would be delighted to have your testimony at this time.

Joe, if you would like to start, we will proceed. We will put your statement in the record as if given in full. If you would like to highlight it, both you and the Clerk, we would be glad to take it on that basis.

TESTIMONY OF HON. WALTER J. STEWART, SECRETARY, U.S. SENATE; AND HON. DONNALD K. ANDERSON, CLERK, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STEWART. I will try to highlight, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all very much for this hearing and for the opportunity to come before you.

The Secretary of the Senate is entrusted with the responsibility of preparing, processing, printing, and safe keeping for the future the official records of the Senate, and in carrying out those responsibilities my staff and I work constantly and carefully and closely with the Government Printing Office to print the Record, the Senate Journal, the Executive Journal, the Calendar of Business, bills, resolutions, reports, vouchers—all of the numerous printed items that are required to run the Senate.

GPO's greatest challenge, and I think their greatest achievement, is the printing of the Congressional Record. It is the envy of the world throughout that we would get this publication the next morning after even a late session. They basically, up until recent years, have done a superb job in meeting the deadlines.

Unfortunately, with increasing frequency, our Record is now incomplete or cut so that the delivery time as set by the Joint Committee on Printing can be met. And even with the practice of cutting the Record, delivery schedules are more and more often not met.

Senators and their staff, and particularly the leadership, rely pretty heavily on the Congressional Record and, in particular, on the Daily Digest, and when it is not available the next morning, it causes some confusion and requires us to come up with some sort of an alternative procedure to substitute for that.

Two years ago, my office undertook a 5-year project to automate the Congressional Record to reduce both our bill for printing, to reduce the keystrokes within our own office, and to try to reduce the number of cut and late-delivery records. This year, we are beginning year three of that project and it is now on schedule.

We have now installed a computer-assisted transcription, or so-called CAT system to be used by the Official Reporters, and this system allows us to capture electronically the verbatim remarks of

Senators in the Chamber. This has been operational since September of 1989. This year, we will also be installing computer work stations in the Official Reporters for both staff and Members to make corrections if they so chose.

Probably, most of the staff—100 percent have said they would like to do this. The Members—it varies, but I would say it is moving in that direction. Probably about half of the Members now can use automation equipment, and the other half still use the pencil.

At this point, we can now send to the transcribers in the Official Reporters' office—they will be able to produce clean copy which we can then send to GPO, which will not have to be rekeyed. It would be scanned instead. We can send this over the fiber link which was installed last summer, but both the GPO and my office still have several technical hurdles to overcome before the Record will be fully automated in terms of integrating certain software and hardware. But, clearly, we are working toward this aim, and we have received the cooperation of GPO fully in this endeavor. They have been very helpful, particularly with their technical people.

During 1990, we automated the production of the Daily Digest, and this copy is now sent to GPO on a disk each night with the printing codes already embedded in the text. GPO estimates that we are saving probably $20,000 in printing costs, and probably at least an hour in printing the Record. GPO staff wrote the specialized software for the PCs which embed their publication codes in the text, and I want to express appreciation to them for that effort.

At the close of the 101st Congress, we tested down-loading certain portions of the Morning Business section of the Record from the LEGIS database, again with the assistance of GPO technical staff. We expect to implement a second phase of automating the Morning Business with the assistance of a small number of Senators. That is somewhat dependent on the installation of the LANs, the local area networks, within the Senators' offices. And until that is completed, which will probably be about 2 years, we probably cannot fully automate that portion.

The final phase of the Record automation project will be assembly of the Record into electronic folios and sending them down to GPO via the fiber link. We expect to continue for the foreseeable future, however, to send down actual paper copies, which they will use in proofing.

In addition to the Record project, last year we began to automate the processing of engrossed bills. At present, we have the capability to produce ceremonial versions of the bills and the resolutions in the Enrolling Clerk's office. GPO has indicated they will be making software and hardware changes this year which will greatly speed up the process of producing engrossed legislation. We now can produce sort of ceremonial versions of engrossed bills, which saves a little bit of money, probably $300 per copy. But more than that, it probably would free up GPO to do other things. This, of course, would be one we would send down for printing. This is the one that we do in-house. The print will actually change a little bit.

We expect to realize significant cost savings by engrossing legislation electronically and printing selected legislation in our office, but we are unable to calculate what those total savings might be. We just have this one example.

I would like to note that GPO completed last session's work for the Enrolling Clerk on November 19, 1990, nearly 1 month after Congress adjourned.

It would be useful to our office if GPO developed a comprehensive automation plan to address both the House and Senate's printing requirements. If we are to achieve our automation goals, we all must work with a system in place and those scheduled for installation in offices where Senate Record copy is created in order to avoid the costly and time-consuming task of rekeying or converting files. This means that GPO must be prepared to deal with systems and software used in the Senate and House offices, as well as those used in my office and the Clerk's office.

The International Organization of Stenographic Workers has rated the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives the best in the world in terms of the speed with which our proceedings are made available. We use the smallest number of staff to produce the most pages of proceedings in the shortest time frame.

In my 34 years in the Senate, I have never seen GPO deliver so many incomplete and late Records as last year's, or fail to produce appropriation bills and calendars when required to maintain the flow of legislation business of the Senate and the House as occurred last fall.

As a result of that, I was in contact with the Joint Committee on Printing, and on September 6, 1990, we invited the Public Printer and some of his top staff to meet with us to discuss the projected legislative schedule, which we expected to be heavy during the coming year, and how we could plan for it.

The workload was as heavy and compact as expected, and I was disappointed that GPO seemed unprepared to meet the challenge. While GPO did communicate with my staff, we were being asked to choose between delivery of the Record and delivery of appropriation bills or other legislative matter. The message was clear that GPO could not meet the legislative needs of Congress and print the Congressional Record. Given such choices, we naturally selected delivery of those items required by the leadership, or as they directed us. At some point, we were prepared to abandon printing of the Record if it would guarantee timely printing of appropriation bills and calendars.

While the Record was printed each day, that portion of the proceedings which was printed was of such an insignificant amount that the Record was of little use. The fact that the Record was delivered late made even the Digest of less value when the Record was received.

It is for this reason that I have directed my staff to develop alternative methods of printing and distributing the Daily Digest and the Senate Calendar in the same way that we now do the Executive Calendar. I have asked the Sergeant-at-Arms to work with my staff in preparing alternative production paths to fully utilize the facilities of the Senate Computer Center, Service Department, and the Post Office. Planning is underway, but I hope we will not have to use these alternate methods to make this vital material available to Senators and staff when they need it.

We are willing to work with the GPO in every way to ensure prompt printing and delivery of the Record and legislative matter throughout this session of Congress. We would hope specifically that the Record is printed to include copy delivery to GPO by 12 midnight, which we understand is the deadline set by the Joint Committee on Printing in order that the Record be delivered to the Chamber by the deadline of 9 a.m. each morning.

We hope that enrolled bills are returned promptly and that post-sine die printing be completed much more quickly than occurred last fall. Finally, we hope that our efforts will significantly improve the Record's accuracy. I assured the Public Printer last fall that my office will fulfill its responsibility to the Senate, and I was pleased to receive his pledge of full cooperation. He has renewed that pledge and I look forward to working with him and his staff to achieve all of our goals.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the committee may have. I would only say in closing that one of the top priorities for the past 4 years has been automation of those areas under my responsibility because that is where we will see the quickest return in terms of time savings and in terms of dollar savings.

Toward that objective, the last assistant secretary that I hired, Gerry Thompson, is a specialist in that area. She fully automated the organization she came from. She is pursuing that aggressively, and she spends a good portion of her time just on these subjects that I have just discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Anderson, we will listen to your testimony and then we will fire some questions at both of you.

TESTIMONY OF HON. DONNALD K. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would say at the outset that our problems and objectives in this context are essentially parallel to those which have been so well articulated by Secretary Stewart in the last few minutes.

The House of Representatives is one of the largest users of GPO services. As the Clerk of the House, I have the responsibility for preparing the text for the House section of the Congressional Record, as well as the Daily Digest. My responsibility includes the printing of all introduced, as well as reported House bills, reports, enrolled and engrossed bills. Enrolled and engrossed bills need to receive top priority for printing. My Office of Printing Services issues requisitions for the leadership and the committees of the House and all member offices. Printing Services also handles all publications required to be printed by the Clerk.

The sine die adjournment of the 101st Congress was one of the most stressful I can recall in my 32 years as a servant of the House of Representatives. Last year, my staff and I met with a GPO representative to discuss the volume of printing for the sine die adjournment. We attempted to prepare GPO for the large volume of printing which we anticipated and which ultimately exceeded even our own expectations. GPO barely managed to meet deadlines at the outset.

When the House began to meet on Saturdays and Sundays, it became obvious that GPO was falling behind and could no longer keep up with the required deadlines. As a result of these and other problems, I would like to recommend to the Joint Committee on Printing that the Public Printer look into the purchase of new equipment and/or the assignment of additional personnel to ensure that the future deadlines are met on a timely basis.

I am prepared and more than happy to work with the Senate, the Joint Committee on Printing, and the Government Printing Office to further support automation of these processes. The House Journal, the Clerk's Report, and other publications required of the Clerk of the House are already automated. The automation of these publications always ensures a timely delivery.

It will be difficult to predict the workload of this Congress and Congresses in the future. The paper trail is bound to become longer and the need to print reports and bills faster will certainly increase.

Again, I urge the Senate, the Joint Committee on Printing, and the Government Printing Office to look into further automation, as I will continue to do, in a most energetic way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statements of Mr. Stewart and Mr. Anderson follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER J. STEWART

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Stevens for inviting me to testify before the Joint Committee on Printing regarding the services provided to the Senate by the Government Printing Office.

The Senate entrusts to the Secretary of the Senate the responsibility for preparing, processing, printing and safekeeping-for-the-future the official records of the Senate. In carrying out these responsibilities, my staff and I work closely and constantly with the Government Printing Office to prepare for publication the Congressional Record, Senate Journal, and Executive Journal the printing of bills, resolutions, committee reports, hearings, and forms necessary for the efficient operation of the Senate, such as vote tally sheets and vouchers; and other documents ordered by the Senate to be printed, like letterhead and envelopes.

GPOs greatest challenge, and I believe its greatest achievement, has been the daily publication of Congress' proceedings. The diligent and highly professional work of the Official Reporters of Debates and the GPO has produced an historical record of availability of these proceedings unmatched by any Parliament in the world. With increasing frequency, however, the Record is incomplete, or "cut", so that delivery times for the Record as set by the Joint Committee on Printing can be met. Even with the practice of "cutting" the Record delivery schedules are more and more often not met.

Senators and staff rely on the availability of the printed proceedings and are hampered in their work when the Record is not available until late morning or several hours after the day's session has begun. The Leadership, in particular, is inconvenienced.

Two years ago, my office undertook a five-year project to automate the Senate's portion of the production of the Congressional Record to both reduce the Senate's bill for printing the Record and to work with the GPO to reduce the number of "cut" and late-delivery Records. This year we are beginning year three of that project. During the past two years, we have installed a computer assisted transcription, or CAT, system for use by the Official Reporters of Debates. This system allows us to capture electronically the verbatim remarks of Senators made in the Chamber. The CAT system has been operational since September, 1989. This year we will install work stations in the Official Reporters' office so Senators who wish to, and staff, can make necessary corrections to Senators' statements using a computer rather than a pencil. In the informal surveys we have taken, 100 of the staff, and a majority of Senators have indicated their willingness to do this work on computers.

At this point, the transcribers in the Reporters' office will be able to produce clean copy which the GPO could scan rather than rekey. We also could send this copy to GPO over the fiber link which was installed last summer, but both the GPO and my office will have to jump some technical hurdles first. But this is clearly the goal we are working toward. We know that we can save millions of dollars each year if we can capture all keystrokes electronically the first time rather than requiring rekeying of data multiple times during the publication process.

During 1990, we successfully automated the production of the Daily Digest. That copy is sent to GPO on a disk each night, with the printing codes already embedded in the text. GPO estimated automating Digest production would trim as much as 30 minutes off the nightly Record production schedule and save something over 20,000 in printing costs each year. GPO's technical staff were instrumental in our success. Their staff wrote the specialized software for our PCs which embed GPO's publication codes in the text of the Digest before the disk is sent to GPO.

At the close of the 101st Congress, we tested downloading certain portions of the Morning Business section of the Record from the Senate's LEGIS database, again with the assistance of GPO's technical staff. We expect to implement a second phase of automating the Morning Business section with the assistance of a small number of Senators who currently use WordPerfect software. We have asked these offices to submit disks containing the Senator's submitted statement which we will forward to GPO with the printed copy. WordPerfect is a requirement because at present GPO can work only with this software and cannot accommodate disks from mini systems still used in some Senators' offices. Mini computer systems are being replaced with Local Area Networks, or LANS, and will use WordPerfect software. We expect that fully automating the Morning Business section of the record will take two years to accomplish from our office and is dependent on the Senate's overall LAN installation schedule. This year, we will perfect our ability to send the LEGIS portions of Morning Business to GPO on disk as well as working with additional offices to submit prepared statements of Senators on disk. GPO will be working with us each step of the way and we welcome their advice and flexibility. The final phase of our Record automation project will be the assembly of the Record into electronic folios and sending them to GPO via the fiber link. We expect, however, to continue for the foreseeable future to send paper copy to GPO for use in proofing. We view and will continue to view paper copy, which frequently contains the handwritten changes of Senators, as the final version against which all proofreading must be done. This includes both statements and legislation as acted upon by the Senate.

In addition to the Record project, last year we began to automate the processing of engrossed bills. At present we have the capability to produce ceremonial versions of bills and resolutions in the Enrolling Clerk's office. GPO has indicated they will be making software and hardware changes this year which will greatly speed-up the process of producing engrossed legislation. We look forward to working with them on this project because our objectives are to be able to 1) engross legislation electronically and send the legislation via fiber link to GPO for printing and binding and 2) print selected engrossed bills in our office in order to meet legislative deadlines. Clearly, we do not anticipate being able to print final engrossed or enrolled bills and resolutions which run many pages because we do not have the large scale printing and binding capabilities required for documents of this size.

We expect to realize significant cost savings by engrossing legislation electronically and printing selected legislation in our office, but we are unable to calculate what those total savings might be. We can provide one example, however. We print the ceremonial versions of the resolution for the election of the Senate's officers in the Enrolling Clerk's office and save $300 per resolution page with the copy available immediately.

I would like to note that GPO completed last session's work for the Enrolling Clerk on November 19, 1990; nearly one month after Congress adjourned.

It would be useful to my office if the GPO developed a comprehensive automation plan to address both the House and Senate's printing requirements. If we are to achieve our automation goals, we all must work with the systems in place and those scheduled for installation in offices where Senate Record copy is created in order to avoid the costly and time-consuming task of rekeying or converting files. This means that GPO must be prepared to deal with systems and software used in Senate and House offices as well as those used in my office and the Clerk's office.

Mr. Chairman, the international organization of stenographic workers rated the United States Senate and House of Representatives the best in the world in terms of the speed with which our proceedings are made available. We use the smallest number of staff to produce the most pages of proceedings in the shortest time frame. In my many years in the Senate, I have never seen GPO deliver so many incomplete and late Records or fail to produce appropriation bills and calendars when required to maintain the flow of legislative business in the Senate and House as occurred last fall.

On September 6, 1990, I invited the Public Printer and his top staff to meet with me to discuss the projected legislative schedule, which I expected to be unusually heavy over an unusually short period of time. The workload was as heavy and compact as expected and I was disappointed that GPO seemed unprepared to meet the challenge. While GPO did communicate with my staff, we were being asked to choose between delivery of the Record and delivery of appropriation bills or other legislative matter. The message was clear that GPO could not meet the legislative needs of Congress and print the Congressional Record. Given such choices, we naturally selected delivery of those items required by the leadership. At one point, we were prepared to abandon printing of the Record if it would guarantee timely printing of appropriation bills and calendars. While the Record was printed each day, that portion of the proceedings which was printed was of such an insignificant amount that the Record was of little use. The fact that the Record was delivered late made even the Digest of less value when the Record was received.

It is for this reason that I have directed my staff to develop alternative methods of printing and distributing the Daily Digest and the Senate Calendar. I have asked the Sergeant at Arms to work with my staff in preparing alternative production paths to fully utilize the facilities of the Senate Computer Center, Service Department and Post Office. Planning is underway, but I hope we will not have to use these alternate methods to make this vital material available to Senators and staff when they need it.

We are willing to work with the GPO in every way to ensure prompt printing and delivery of the Record and legislative matter throughout this session of Congress. We would hope, specifically, that the Record is printed to include copy delivered to GPO by 12:00 midnight, which we understand is the deadline set by the Joint Committee on Printing in order that the Record be delivered to the Chamber by the deadline of 9:00 a.m. each morning. We hope that enrolled bills are returned promptly and that post-sine die printing be completed much more quickly than occurred last fall. And finally, we hope that our efforts will significantly improve the Record's accuracy. I assured the Public Printer last fall that my office will fulfill its responsibilities to the Senate and I was pleased to receive his pledge of full cooperation. He has renewed that pledge and I look forward to working with him and his staff to achieve all our goals.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the committee may have.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. DONNALD K. ANDERSON

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Joint Committee. It is a pleasure to testify this morning before the Joint Committee on Printing.

The House of Representatives is one of the largest users of the Government Printing Office (GPO). As Clerk of the House, I have the responsibility of preparing the text for the House section of the Congressional Record as well as the Daily Digest. My responsibility includes the printing of all introduced as well as reported House Bills, Reports, Enrolled and Engrossed Bills. Enrolled and Engrossed bills need to receive top priority for printing.

My Office of Printing Services issue requisitions for the Leadership of the House, the Committees of the House, and all Member Offices. Printing Services also handles all publications printed by the Clerk.

The Sine die Adjournment of the 101st Congress was one of the most stressful I can recall.

Last year my staff and I met with a GPO representative to discuss the volume of printing for the Sine Die Adjournment. We attempted to prepare GPO for the large volume of printing which we anticipated and which ultimately exceeded even our own expectations.

GPO barely managed to meet deadlines at the outset. When the House began to meet on Saturdays, and Sundays, it became obvious that GPO was falling behind and could no longer keep up with the required deadlines. As a result of these and other problems I would like to recommend to the Joint Committee on Printing that the Public Printer look into the purchase of new equipment and or the assignment of additional personnel to ensure that future deadlines are met on a timely basis.

I will be more than happy to work with the Senate, the Joint Committee on Printing and the Government Printing Office to further support automation. The House

Journal, The Clerk's Report and other publications required by the Clerk are already automated.

The automation of these publications always ensures a timely delivery. It will be difficult to predict the workload of this Congress and Congresses in the future. The paper trail is bound to become longer and the need to print reports and bills faster. Again, I urge the Senate, the Joint Committee on Printing, and the Government Printing Office to look into further automation.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Anderson. I will limit my questions to the Secretary of the Senate, and I suspect you might want to back-and-forth a little bit.

This may seem like a strange question, but it makes a point. Secretary Stewart, on Saturday, January 12th, the Senate voted to give the President of the United States the authority to use force in the Persian Gulf. Many have called this vote the vote of the decade. How is it possible that the vote on S.J. Res. 2, which appears on page S403 in that day's Record, shows former Senator Wilson as having voted?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, quite frankly, they just did not proofcheck their database. I am informed that GPO maintains their database on the names of Senators, and we send GPO a copy of the actual vote tally showing how each Senator voted on a specific vote. The staff of GPO then takes this tally and keys it into their own database. But, frankly, they just did not proofread it and they did not check it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did we have 101 Senators vote?

Mr. STEWART. We did.

The CHAIRMAN. We had 101 Senators vote. That is unusual, isn't it?

Mr. STEWART. It is very unusual. The new Senator, Seymour, was listed as voting, but they did not remove former Senator Wilson.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is awful hard to be Governor of California and a United States Senator at the same time.

How is GPO doing with the Record so far this year?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, this year I would say that accuracy still seems to be a problem.

The CHAIRMAN. What seems to be a problem?

Mr. STEWART. Accuracy. The first quorum call of the 102d Congress was incorrectly printed and had to be reprinted on January 4th. The January 3d Record included a listing of communications received by the 101st Congress, which was the previous Congress. The Official Reporters received an unusual number of complaints about typographical errors in the January 14th Record. And on January 14th, we had 209 bills introduced, and by January 18th, I think only 57 of those bills had arrived at the dockets room.

The CHAIRMAN. Over the past several years, complaints have been raised about the inaccuracy of the Record. In your testimony, you stated you hoped to be able to improve the accuracy through automation. Now, you just stated about the inaccuracies coming now. How do you expect to offset that, Joe?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, the fewer actual keystrokes you have, the less chance you have for error, so that if we are sending down to the GPO a disk—let us say if a Senator is going to make a statement in Morning Business and we send a disk that has that statement on it, it goes through the Official Reporters, it goes down to

GPO. There is less chance; they get the disk and it goes right into their automated system and there is no chance for human error.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the committee the information regarding the exact number of times a Record was cut in 1990?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, it was cut a total of 18 times.

The CHAIRMAN. Eighteen times?

Mr. STEWART. Eighteen, and what I would be happy to furnish the record is a listing of those times and the exact time that we received the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have some kind of record about when it was cut, and the delay, days of delay, in getting the report.

Mr. STEWART. We have that, and I will be happy to supply that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. If you would do that, I would be grateful to you.

[The information follows:]

Below are the dates and approximate times during the proceedings when the Government Printing Office cut the Record for one reason or another during the 101st Congress, Second Session. Each of these times was determined by referencing the internal folio number recorded on the Official Reporter's transcript log sheet for the last item printed in each Record in question. Each folio number represents a time.

The table below reflects first the date on which a Record was "cut" (1), followed by the point of time in the transcript where the cut occurred (2), then by the time of delivery of that portion of transcript at which the "cut" occurred (3), along with the time that final transcript was shipped by GPO messenger (4).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
May 24, 1990	7:34 PM	11:25 PM	1:50 AM
June 21, 1990	10:31 PM	12 midnight	12 midnight
June 28, 1990	2:50 PM	8:19 PM	2:58 AM
July 24, 1990	6:05 PM	10:34 PM	1:23 AM
July 25, 1990	6:57 PM	10:20 PM	12:35 AM
August 1, 1990	8:00 PM	11:18 PM	2:37 AM
August 2, 1990	7:02 PM	11:15 PM	1:41 AM
August 3, 1990	12 noon	5:52 PM	9:44 AM
August 4, 1990	4:55 PM	9:40 PM	9:40 PM
September 25, 1990	3:40 PM	7:04 PM	11:55 PM
October 17, 1990	8:40 PM	12:11 AM	2:25 AM
October 18, 1990	9:01 AM	12:49 PM	3:25 AM
October 19, 1990	11:40 AM	4:14 PM	2:45 AM
October 22, 1990	6:30 PM	10:17 PM	1:45 AM
October 23, 1990 [1]			
October 24, 1990	6:25 PM	10:32 PM	2:50 AM
October 25, 1990	1:45 PM	6:03 PM	1:25 AM
October 26, 1990	1:50 PM	8:31 PM	3:23 AM

[1] GPO did not print any Senate in Part I

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Office of Conservation and Preservation does a great deal of binding of materials for the Senate Library. Have you been satisfied with the bindery work done by the GPO, and do you feel this work is handled cost effectively?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, we haven't been totally satisfied in either the timeliness, in the cost, or in the quality. In terms of the quality, we find that going outside we could get a better quality. In terms of cost and what we are assessed, we could do it cheaper, but as I have discussed with, I think, you and your staff, if only 95 items go to GPO and 5 go to private contractors, the total cost gets spread over 95. So, that is something we need to address. But in some cases, we have found dramatic discrepancies as to what we could get that same work done for by an outside contractor.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean, discrepancies?

Mr. STEWART. Well, in terms of cost. I mean, it would be almost 50 percent less in terms of——

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty percent less?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir, in some instances. I would be happy to supply, if you would like—we have a listing of items that have been sent by the Office of Senate Conservation, the amount that we were assessed, and the amount that he could have gotten that done by a private contractor.

The CHAIRMAN. Otherwise, he could charge you the amount and then sublet it and make a profit.

Mr. STEWART. I would say the Senate would save money as opposed to making a profit.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I know, but the Public Printer could do that, I guess.

Mr. STEWART. He could. The way they allocate their costs is an internal matter.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated you expected the workload last fall to be unusually heavy over an unusually short period of time. Can you give us a guesstimate of your expectations for this session of Congress?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, that would be problematic, but I would say that with the amount of time that we are spending now on the Persian Gulf and the amount of time that we will be spending on budgetary and appropriations bills in funding this item, that is going to push a lot of other things to the end of the session. I would think that we would be almost as heavy this session and next as we were last. I think we are looking toward another crunch.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Congressman Rose.

Representative ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions. It is a pleasure to see both of these gentlemen here. I have worked with Mr. Anderson for a long number of years, as long as I have been in Congress. And I have certainly have gotten to know the Secretary of the Senate, and I want to thank him for all the things he has done for me. In my brief knowledge with him, he has been a real friend and I look forward to working with him.

Talking about binding, I will just tell you one Wayne Hayes story. One time when I first came here, I remember the Public Printer delivered a copy of the Congressional Handbook to Wayne Hayes. It was beautifully embossed and everything, and he opened it and it was upside down. He was sure the Public Printer had done this on purpose, you understand, and I don't know whether he shot him or just hit him, but it was not pleasant. [Laughter.] I don't have any questions. I know you wouldn't do a thing like that, but Wayne was——

The CHAIRMAN. I would just blow smoke in his face.

Representative ROSE. Oh, OK. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Stevens.

Senator STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I have got some top executives from my government in the State of Alaska here and I am going to have to leave in a minute. I do have one question to ask Mr. Stewart, though, and I am pleased to see the Clerk and I understand what his position is with regard to the House.

Joe, I really commend you in the way you have really driven to get the high-tech concepts incorporated into our activities, but my question is to the relevancy of some of the things that are printed. I remember in the last session I was particularly interested in trying to get a statement that a Member had made on the floor and other people had told me they had seen on the television. I had not heard it.

It was one of those nights we were going through the night, and when I got to the Record the next morning the things that were printed in the Record were things from Morning Business and from sort of the appendix, so to speak, and the actual amount that was in the Record from the proceedings was very limited.

Your testimony indicates that this committee did that and set the deadline of midnight and indicated that if the Record was delivered by 9 a.m. complete with what was said on the floor until midnight, that is sufficient. Should we revisit that and determine that only the things that are said on the floor should take priority?

In other words, it appears that the Congressional Record process is being utilized for things that are already printed, as you point out—Members' statements, insertions in the Record. All of those things seem to come through much more rapidly than the things that are said on the floor. I should think with this new automation now, we could change that to 2 or 3 and still get it at 6 in the morning if we weren't fooling around with things that are really submitted for history and not really part of the active debate on the floor.

Mr. STEWART. I would agree with that, Senator, entirely. Obviously, the things that you have in the beginning in Morning Business are things that come in early. They are preprinted. They are pretty easy to deal with, and that is why you find they can get those put in, and then you find those statements in the Record the same way.

The real difficulty, of course, is taking the actual transcript of proceedings.

Sure, I think we should constantly revisit this. Obviously, automation is the wave of the future and the more of this we do, hopefully, the fewer chances for inaccuracy, and we will cut time off of it. You know, that was not a normal situation. I mean, we found a lot of times the body of the Record was missing, and I am sorry to say that.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I noticed it, too, and I think many Members commented on it. And with the new automation we already have in place, it would seem that we ought to revisit the guidelines we have set that for what is considered on time. I should think that with this new automation, if we are saving at least an hour, then at the minimum we ought to be able to deal with 1 o'clock rather than midnight in terms of keeping up with this process.

But the real problem is for those of us who really do use the Record and check what is said on the floor and try to deal with the debate on an on-time basis. This process of automation has not aided that goal, and I would like to see it more addressed to particularly what people can hear or see on the television who have got the time to do that.

I get calls in the middle of the night that someone said something on the floor, and I haven't seen or heard it and I come in the next morning and it is not in the Record. Then I really can't deal with that question on a timely basis. The next day has actually passed by before we can actually find out what was said.

Mr. STEWART. You know, we are moving as fast as we can to automate the Congressional Record, and just to alleviate this circumstance now, all of our transcribers on the floor use a stenotype machine and those tapes are automatically put in and transcribed on what they call a Magnum within the Office of Official Reporters. We now have coming in to us something called Steno-Rams, which, besides the tape, these will all be embedded on a cassette, and so you can just take a cassette to each individual transcriber, and that again will cut off time.

But the Record is not automated yet, and it is going to be a difficult process, but when we do, I think that we will be able to save a lot of time. I would hope we would get the Record on time.

Senator STEVENS. I have just been informed that the deadline that I mentioned that you set forth in your statement was established by the Handbook on Congressional Printing, and that that was compiled in November of 1917. So I am not sure that we should really be dealing with what is on time according to this handbook any longer is my point.

Mr. STEWART. Senator, we work with the Joint Committee on Printing on setting those times of what they feel can be done, and then, of course, sometimes we have to make calls of priorities and that is in consultation with the leadership of seeing what they want most the next day. Do you want this tax bill or do you want the Record?

Senator STEVENS. Well, again, I commend you. I am one of those who visits that office where we can see how the reporters have recorded what we thought we have said, and I think that we have access to that on a very timely basis. And now it is possible to check the accuracy of it, and I am not one who believes that we ought to have as much liberty as we have to change it. But its accuracy is often important and I think the things that you have done to improve that system, and now the ability to literally look at the computer on a real-time basis within minutes and to see if it is accurate—I think that is a very great thing you have done, so I commend you.

Representative ROSE (presiding). Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any questions, but I just——

Senator STEVENS. Would you yield to me 1 minute? I do have some questions at the time Mr. Houk appears. I would ask unanimous consent that those be submitted for the record so that he may respond to them for the record. They pertain to questions I asked at the last hearing.

Representative ROSE. They shall be put in the record.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

[The questions of Senator Stevens follow:]

Question. Re Overtime and Weekend Scheduling:

1. During the July hearing I asked if an altered production schedule would help reduce the need for weekend overtime at the GPO. I offered to work out a schedule that would provide the product on time and reduce overtime costs for the weekend . . . if that were possible to do so. I appreciate the Public Printer's attention to this matter and ask to insert into the hearing record the Public Printer's response to me in its entirety. In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Public Printer's letter points out that overtime had been reduced by 24 percent in the second half of fiscal year 1990 and that in the weeks between labor day and the adjournment of Congress some overtime may continue to be required. So I would ask only if Mr. Houk has any additional information to add to that report.

(Reference: Pages 2, 53, and 57, Hearing before the Joint Committee on Printing, Congress of the United States, One Hundred First Congress, Second Session, July 19, 1990.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, DC,
November 27, 1990.

Hon. TED STEVENS
Joint Committee on Printing
Room SH-818, Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6650

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Thank you for your letter of September 24, 1990, requesting my reaction to various recommendations prepared by the General Accounting Office (GAO), for reducing the use of weekend overtime by the Government Printing Office (GPO). I regret the delay in my reply, but I wanted to include GPO's final overtime use data for FY 1990 which has just recently been compiled.

As I stated in the hearing before the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) on the GAO report, GPO's use of overtime is an issue that is of great concern to me, and I want to assure you that we have already begun taking steps to address it. We have limited the use of all administrative overtime at GPO, except in those areas that work in direct support of revenue-generating areas. We have also begun addressing the use of weekend overtime by GPO's Production Department, and we are preparing to review alternative measures for improving the scheduling of in-house work to reduce the need for such overtime.

I believe these actions, which have been announced to all GPO managers, have created a new managerial climate at GPO in which the prospect of weekend and other overtime will no longer be treated as routine. To that extent, therefore, I am in agreement with GAO's recommendation that the use of overtime should be discouraged or, to put it more precisely, more appropriately managed.

GPO Overtime Use in FY 1990. The final data on GPO's overtime use for FY 1990 provides evidence that this new climate has taken effect. For FY 1990, the total number of overtime hours used by all GPO areas was reduced by 11 percent compared to the total number of overtime hours used in FY 1989. This reduction was particularly notable in the second half of FY 1990 (April 1-September 30), when total GPO overtime use declined by 24 percent from the amount of overtime used in the first half of the fiscal year.

As you know, the preponderance of GPO overtime is used by the Production Department. Total Production Department overtime use in FY 1990 declined by 7 percent compared to FY 1989. It declined by nearly 18 percent in the second half of FY 1990 as compared to the first half of the year.

Considerable progress has also been made in controlling administrative overtime, as the result of limitations I directed in a memorandum to all GPO managers dated July 15, 1990. During August and September 1990, the number of administrative overtime hours dropped by approximately 60 percent compared to average levels in the first 10 months of FY 1990.

Some Overtime Will Continue To Be Required. I believe our on-going efforts to manage the use of overtime, including weekend overtime, have had a positive effect to date. However, as you no doubt are aware, GPO's ability to be responsive to Congress' printing needs and the time-sensitivity assigned to Congressional work will continue to work against the complete elimination of overtime. In the weeks between Labor Day and the adjournment of the 101st Congress, for example, GPO's Production Department used significant amounts of overtime to meet delivery dates for Congressional documents that were essential to the conduct of legislative business.

During this period of intense legislative activity, it was not appropriate, in my view, to impose overtime limitations on production areas that might have interfered with the orderly and timely completion of GPO's mission. Instead, my senior staff and I pursued improved communications with the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and other Congressional offices to ensure that Congress' printing needs were properly scheduled and met in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible. Based on our experience with these offices, I believe improved scheduling of both Congressional and agency work is the key to achieving appropriate levels of overtime use.

Comments on GAO Suggestions. In that regard, I believe several of the suggestions made by the GAO have merit, and some already have been included in the goals and objectives I have established for GPO. For example, to improve scheduling options, we plan to address the establishment of appropriate lead times for different classes of work and communicate those lead times to Congress and client agencies. We also plan to work more closely with Congressional Committees and client agencies on future printing plans so that GPO can better anticipate upcoming work.

In addition, we are going to analyze GPO's historical and current workloads and make scheduling arrangements to meet anticipated demand. As one part of this objective, we have already established a new cost reporting procedure to identify and provide the means for controlling the relationship between overtime costs incurred by production support functions, and overtime worked by the Production Department itself

As another possible step in this direction, we may consider establishing program contracts for certain categories of Congressional work, to be utilized in periods of severe Congressional workload demand, such as that experienced in the weeks following Labor Day 1990. I would not be opposed to such a concept, provided that it would expedite the production of Congress' printing needs in an orderly, cost-effective manner.

With regard to the GAO's other suggestions, I would have no objection to requiring that GPO provide Congressional Committees and client agencies with estimates for overtime in advance of scheduling the work. However, it must be recognized that GPO does not schedule overtime as a routine matter. Therefore, in practice this requirement would have a limited application to job orders where it is clear that weekend work would be required.

I am aware that in the past GPO has investigated the costs and benefits of adjusting GPO's regular workweek, with the objective of establishing a Tuesday through Saturday workweek for some employees. I am not opposed to addressing that issue again, to the extent that the total cost reductions to be achieved through the reduced use of overtime would more than offset cost increases that may be incurred through the provision of additional engineering, materials management, security service, cafeteria, and other support services beyond the regular Monday-Friday workweek.

With regard to the recommendation concerning necessary improvements to managers' performance plans, I believe options are available to include specific performance plan measures for improving the scheduling of work and for holding managers accountable for achieving them, as long as such measures do not unfairly penalize managers for workload demands which are beyond their control. I also believe there would be merit to exploring the possibilities for implementing incentives—such as productivity improvement awards—for reducing weekend work.

Overtime Control Measures. In line with these recommendations from the GAO, I am also pleased to inform you that I have recently received a report from GPO's Inspector General (IG) which contains a variety of recommendations to improve internal controls over overtime. Specifically, the report recommends measures to ensure that: (1) appropriate overtime authorization procedures are followed; (2) employees are paid for overtime only for overtime worked and in accordance with GPO directives; (3) overtime is adequately controlled to minimize payroll costs; (4) overtime costs are charged correctly to specific jobs; and (5) overtime is kept to a minimum and used only when necessary, in accordance with existing procedure regarding the issuance of IG reports, GPO's Assistant Public Printers have agreed to implement the IG's recommendations that are applicable to their respective areas.

One final point I would like to make is that the appropriate management of overtime use at GPO will continue to be implemented within the context of a broad range of improvements. These improvements have the basic goal of reducing the cost and improving the quality and timeliness of GPO's products and services. As progress is made in achieving this goal—through improved management, modernization, and related measures—I anticipate that the cost impact of overtime which does become necessary will decline.

Once again, I appreciate your interest in this important matter, and I appreciate receiving the GAO's suggestions. As you may know, we are currently in the process of developing an action plan to respond to the recommendations contained in the GAO's report; this plan will be delivered to the JCP at an early date. I look forward to continuing to work with you and the JCP toward achieving the most efficient and cost-effective provision of GPO's products and services to Congress, Federal agencies, and the public.

ROBERT W. HOUK,
Public Printer.

[The questions of Senator Stevens continued:]

Question. Re Aging Equipment:

2. At the same hearing I asked specifically if the relationship of printing press equipment age was related to the high percentage of idle time for this machinery documented by the GAO report. I asked the GAO to give us an opinion as to the need for the kinds of equipment the Congress as a whole should provide the GPO based upon GAO's analysis that major equipment acquisitions have not been made for many years; that some of the equipment is 30 years old and production efficiency is affected by equipment age. Do we have updated information on this matter?

(Reference: Page 3, Hearing before the Joint Committee on Printing Congress of the United States One Hundred First Congress, Second Session, July 19, 1990.)

Senator HATFIELD. I would just like to make an observation, and that is that Mr. Stewart has had 34 years of service to the Senate and Mr. Anderson 32 years, I understood you to say, to the House of Representatives. I think the institutional memory, the devotion to your tasks as you have performed them, and all the others ought to be commented upon from time to time.

We live in an institution where Members are quick to take credit and oftentimes just as quick to lay blame on staff when things don't go well, and the kind of work and contribution staff makes in general and, in this case, in two specifics, I think, is worthy of noting that in the record. And I just want to thank both of you as representatives of all the staff work that goes on in the institution of the Senate and the House, and especially to Mr. Stewart, with whom I have had the opportunity to work over a period of time. Your attentiveness to your duties, your willingness to accommodate minority as well as majority Members—I, as a Member of the minority, want to certainly acknowledge your fine work in the Senate, Mr. Stewart, and your contribution here this morning is illustrative of the quality of your work that you have performed in every task that you have had given you.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make that observation at this time.

Mr. STEWART. Senator, thank you very much. If I may respond, the accomplishments that my office has been able to achieve are in large measure due to the support we have gotten from the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and we appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Ford presiding). Congressman, do you have some questions or a statement?

Representative ROBERTS. I would just like to echo the comments made by Mr. Stevens, Mr. Rose, and Senator Hatfield in regard to the service of these gentlemen, and more especially thank the Clerk for his longtime splendid efforts in behalf of the House Administration Committee, and more especially in behalf of the House, and whose sartorial splendor is second to none as we carry on the tradition of this very fine institution.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you referring to the mustache, Congressman?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, he did try out for the "Lonesome Dove" part, but——

The CHAIRMAN. We were just commenting up here a while ago that our Secretary has a mustache, but it doesn't have the splendor, I guess, or splinter——

Representative ROBERTS. I think we ought to leave that right where it is. [Laughter.] But at any rate, I think the comments by Senator Stevens were most appropriate. I come from a background of newspaper work and I must admit that I don't think anything happened good after 1958 in this country. I don't want any change. I am sort of a mugwump. I still watch the "Gunsmoke" reruns and think that is the way life ought to be.

But the revolution in the electronics business and in the printing industry has been nothing short of just unbelievable. And according to the testimony by both of you gentlemen—and the very candid remarks in regard to the Secretary, I think, are most pertinent.

I think what we are facing here if we get into a crunch—and Lord knows, we will be in a crunch—the GPO may very well be non-germane. I am going over all the late reports. My goodness, on the 27th, 8 days late; that means the various golden words of truth that we all said in the late sessions to set the record straight would not even be able to be sent to the voters prior to election to make an informed choice. That is almost unbelievable.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you have enough money in your campaign fund to reprint it?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, we tried. But I am very concerned about this. I think some of the suggestions I have for the Public Printer, quite frankly, are to give these gentlemen the means—if we get into a crunch, they are going to do it themselves, and we have the technology to do that.

We have people who say that the GPO has outlived its usefulness, and if we do not get to a performance standard here that is acceptable, despite all of the problems—and I am not trying to put any blame anywhere—that is what we are going to do.

So I commend you for a very candid statement and a very fine statement, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman. I hope Mr. Houk is getting the message that he may be presiding over the demise of GPO.

Thank you both, gentlemen. I have no further questions, and we will try to accommodate your eloquent request.

At the request of the JCP, the IG's office at GPO looked into the problems of printing the Record and so-called hot bills. Our next witness is Lewis "Bud" Small, GPO's Inspector General.

Bud, would you come forward? You have a large binder there. I hope that isn't a full statement. If you would brief that, we will put the total statement in the record.

TESTIMONY OF LEWIS L. SMALL, INSPECTOR GENERAL, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE; ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN LOPEZ, ACTING ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR INSPECTIONS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. SMALL. Good morning. I would like to introduce, Mr. Chairman, Mr. John Lopez, on my left. He is my Acting Assistant Inspector General for Inspections.

The CHAIRMAN. You are having a hard time getting permanent appointments down there, aren't you?

Mr. SMALL. We are working on it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the JCP, we are pleased to be here today to discuss our review of production and delivery of congressional material to the Congress by the Government Printing Office. My statement will highlight specific areas which we believe relate directly to the late deliveries of congressional material that we have identified in our report.

In our review of over 2,000 production and delivery records, representing an estimated 116,437,128 printed pages of congressional material—for example, Congressional Records, resolutions, amendments and bills, excluding enrolled bills—produced during the period of October 1 through October 31, 1990, we found that of the 26 issues published, the Congressional Record was delivered late either in whole or in part on four occasions, and these deliveries were delayed from 40 to 51 minutes. Of 1,627 congressional bills, acts, and amendments printed, 22 high-priority items were delivered late. Delays recorded ranged from 1 to 6 days and included six major appropriations bills and three conference reports.

We were unable to surface any contingency plan which would prevent late deliveries of congressional material during any future high-volume period. We have to reasonably conclude that the late congressional deliveries documented in our report will occur in the future if the production and delivery systems that were in place during our review period remain unchanged.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, we would like to note that a total of 181,142 pages of congressional material were processed through the production department during the period September 5 through October 28, 1990. This was represented to our office as a significant achievement under extraordinary conditions. This accomplishment was acknowledged by the production manager at the GPO in a memorandum dated October 30, 1990, which was sent to all production department employees.

Mr. Chairman, our GPO personnel cited many reasons for delayed deliveries of congressional material. Among those we have identified and reported were non-existence of a second shift, that 4 p.m. to midnight shift; equipment breakdowns; heavy workload; prioritization; hectic scheduling; and the late submission of manuscript copies from Congress.

During the course of our investigation, many of the persons interviewed stated that there were errors in the records system that is used by GPO that is used by GPO to track material production. We know that this system, known as the Production Estimating and Planning Systems, PEPS, has had flaws in it in the past.

As a matter of fact, the OIG conducted an audit of this system in 1985 and made recommendations for improvements at that time. A recent Office of Audits preliminary review of that system indicates some improvement. However, we anticipate conducting another audit of the system during this fiscal year to determine what additional improvements are needed.

Mr. Chairman, we noted in our report summary that we found no evidence of violation of law, rule, or regulation in the late deliveries by GPO of congressional material. This conclusion is based on information reported by certain GPO employees regarding their reliance on various unwritten agreements with individuals in or affiliated with the Congress. These agreements appear to set standards for timely delivery not specified in any section of Title 44 of "the rules and regulations for publication of the Congressional Record," as cited recently in Volume 36, No. 140 of the Congressional Record, dated October 17, 1990. The validity of these standards and their impact on any legal interpretation of GPO's or Congress' reliance on them in adhering to Title 44, Section 903 and others of the above-cited "rules and regulations" is outside the purview of my office.

Our investigation covered a specific time frame, and the findings are contained in my report. However, interest did not cease with the closing of our official inquiry. We are currently looking into ways that GPO can improve in the areas that seem to be at the heart of the late deliveries we have identified. We have already furnished a management implication report to the Public Printer detailing a number of these recommendations. We look forward to working closely with the Public Printer to bring the issue of late deliveries of congressional material to a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. My colleague and I will be pleased to answer any questions that you and any other members of the JCP may have. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Small follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LEWIS L. SMALL

Mr. Chairman and members of the Joint Committee on Printing, we are pleased to be here today to discuss our review of production and delivery of congressional material to the Congress by the Government Printing Office (GPO). My statement will highlight specific areas which we believe relate directly to the late deliveries of congressional material that we have identified in our report. In our review of over 2,000 production and delivery records, representing an estimated 116,437,128 printed pages of congressional material, i.e., Congressional Records, resolutions, amendments and bills (excluding enrolled bills) produced during the period October 1 through October 31, 1990, (Exhibit A) we found that:

Of the 26 issues published, the Congressional Record was delivered late either in whole or in part on 4 occasions and these deliveries were delayed from 40 to 51 minutes (Exhibit B). Of 1,627 congressional bills, acts and amendments printed, 22 high priority items were delivered late. Delays recorded ranged from 1 to 6 days and included 8 major appropriations bills and 3 conference reports (Exhibit C).

We were unable to surface any contingency plan which would prevent late deliveries of congressional material during any future high volume period. We have to reasonably conclude that the late congressional deliveries documented in our report will occur in the future if the production and delivery systems, that were in place during our review period, remain unchanged.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, we would like to note that a total of 181,142 of congressional pages were processed through the production department during the period September 5 through October 28, 1990. This was represented to our office as a significant achievement under extraordinary conditions. This accomplishment was acknowledged by the production manager in a memorandum dated October 30, 1990, sent to all production department employees (Exhibit D).

Mr. Chairman, GPO personnel cited many reasons for delayed deliveries of congressional material. Among those we have identified and reported were: non-existence of a second shift (4 p.m. to midnight), equipment breakdowns, heavy workload, prioritization, hectic scheduling, and the late submission of manuscript copies from Congress.

During the course of our investigation, many of the persons interviewed stated that there were errors in the record system that is used by GPO to track material production. We know that this system, known as the production estimating and planning system (PEPS), has had flaws in it in the past. As a matter of fact, the OIG conducted an audit on this system in 1985 and made recommendations for improvements at that time. A recent Office of Audits preliminary review of the system indicates some improvement, however, we anticipate conducting another audit of the system during this fiscal year to determine what additional improvements are needed.

Mr. Chairman, we noted in our report summary that we found no evidence of violation of law, rule or regulation in the late deliveries by GPO of congressional material. This conclusion is based on information reported by certain GPO employees regarding their reliance on various unwritten agreements with individuals in or affiliated with the Congress. These agreements appear to set standards for timely delivery not specified in any section of Title 44 or "the rules and regulations for publication of the Congressional Record" as cited recently in Vol. 36, No. 140 of the Congressional Record, dated October 17, 1990. The validity of these standards and their impact on any legal interpretation of GPO's or Congress' reliance on them in adhering to Title 44, Section 906, and others or the above cited "rules and regulations" is outside the purview of my office.

Our investigation covered a specific time frame and the findings are contained in my report, however, interest did not cease with the closing of our official inquiry. We are currently looking into ways that GPO can improve in the areas that seem to be at the heart of the late deliveries we have identified. We have already furnished a management implication report to the Public Printer detailing a number of these recommendations. We look forward to working closely with the Public Printer to bring the issue of late deliveries of congressional material to a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. My colleague and I will be pleased to answer any questions that you and other members of the JCP may have.

EXHIBIT A

A calculation of the figures annotated on Bills to Press Sheets made available by the Congressional Printing Management Division; and figures incorporated in the Congressional Record PEPS system, revealed that the GPO produced the following amount of pages pertaining to Congressional Bills, Resolutions, Amendments, and the Congressional Record during the period October 1-31, 1990:

	Pages
Bills/Resolutions/Amendments	[1] 47,649,848
Congressional Records	68,787,280
Total	116,437,128

[1] Figure does not include Enrolled Bills

The Congressional Record figures are an accumulation of the copies, to include advanced copies and subsequent parts to the Record, which were delivered to:

1) The Senate and House Chambers.
2) The Longworth and Dirksen Buildings.
3) Other agencies and GPO Warehouses.

EXHIBIT B—CONGRESSIONAL LATE DELIVERY REPORT FOR MONTH OF OCTOBER 1990

[CATEGORY: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Title	Date/Time Last Record Received at GPO	Scheduled Date/Time for Delivery	Confirmed Delivery Date/Time	Reason Given for Delayed Delivery to Congress
No. 136 Dateline Oct. 12, 1990	Oct 13, 1990, 0134	Oct 15, 1990, 0940 (S) Oct 13, 1990, 1000 (H)	Oct 13, 1990, 1223 Oct 13, 1990, 1243	GPG received the last copy of the manuscript from Congress at 1:34 a.m., Oct. 16, 1990, rather than by the 9:00 p.m., Oct. 12, 1990 deadline (advanced copy delivery).
			Oct 13, 1990, 1256 (S) Oct 13, 1990, 1315 (H)	Full delivery made.
Issue No. 138 Dateline Oct. 15, 1990	Oct 16, 1990, 0425	Oct 16, 1990, 0900 (S) Oct 16, 1990, 1000 (H)	Oct 16, 1990 [1], 0947 Oct 16, 1990, 1005	Web break caused by broken sheer pin in two group 59 presses. GPO received the last copy of the manuscript from Congress at 4:15 a.m., Oct. 16, 1990, rather than by the 9:00 p.m., Oct. 15, 1990 deadline (advanced copy delivery).
			Oct 17, 1990, 1050 (S) Oct 17, 1990, 1113 (H)	Full delivery made.
Issue No. 139 Dateline Oct. 16, 1990	Oct 17, 1990, 0315	Oct 17, 1990, 0900 (S) Oct 17, 1990, 1000 (H)	Oct 17, 1990, 0940 Oct 17, 1990, 0931	GPO received the last copy of the manuscript from Congress at 3:15 a.m., Oct. 17, 1990, rather than by the 9:00 p.m., Oct. 16, 1990 deadline (advance copy delivery).
			Oct 19, 1990, 1140 (S) Oct 19, 1990, 1201 (H)	Full delivery made.

EXHIBIT B—CONGRESSIONAL LATE DELIVERY REPORT FOR MONTH OF OCTOBER 1990

[CATEGORY: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Title	Date/Time Last Record Received at GPO	Scheduled Date/Time for Delivery	Confirmed Delivery Date/Time	Reason Given for Delayed Delivery to Congress
Issue No. 140 Dateline Oct. 17, 1990	Oct. 18, 1990, 0150	Oct. 18, 1990, 0900 (S) Oct. 18, 1990, 1000 (H)	Oct. 18, 1990, 0951 Oct. 18, 1990, 0950	GPO received the last copy of the manuscript from Congress at 1:50 a.m., Oct. 18, 1990, rather than by the 9:00 p.m., Oct. 17, 1990 deadline (advanced copy delivery).
			Oct. 19, 1990, 1045 (S) Oct. 19, 1990, 1045 (H)	Full delivery made of issue No. 141 without Part II, to include the "cut" versions of issue No. 140.
Issue No. 149 Dateline Oct. 26, 1990	Oct. 27, 1990, 0340	Oct. 27, 1990, 0900 (Senate only)	Oct. 27, 1990,[1] 0948	GPO received the last copy of the manuscript from Congress at 3:40 a.m., Oct. 27, 1990, rather than by the 9:00 p.m., Oct. 26, 1990 deadline (advanced copy delivery).
			Oct. 31, 1990, 0942 (S) Oct. 31, 1990, 1015 (H)	Full delivery made.

---

[1] Annotates advanced copy delivery per bindery records.
Scheduled date/time annotates when the Senate and House convene.

EXHIBIT C—CONGRESSIONAL LATE DELIVERY REPORT FOR MONTH OF Oct. 1990

[CATEGORY BILLS]

Title	Date/Time Received at GPO	Final Scheduled Date/Time for Delivery	Unconfirmed Delivery Date	Days Late	Area Causing Delay [1]	Reason Given for Delayed Delivery to Congress
0358 EAN (HR)—**AN ACT** To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to change the level, and preference system for admission, of immigrants to the United States, and to provide for administrative naturalization, and for other purposes.	Oct 3, 1990, 2019	Oct 4, 1990, 0500	Oct 6, 1990	2	EPD/PS	No 2d shift available to work on item in pamphlet section, EPD delay caused by hectic schedule; large influx of congressional work to produce.
0490 EH (HR)—**A BILL** To offset the competitive advantage which foreign producers have as a result of not having to meet environmental, health, welfare, and safety requirements of the kinds imposed on United States coal producers, and for other purposes.	Oct 3, 1990, 2045	Oct 4, 1990, 0500	Oct 5, 1990	1	PS	Pamphlet section had no 2d shift to work on matter; may have sat until higher priority jobs completed.
3338 RS (SEN)—**AN ACT** Public Law 101-593 To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey all interest of the United States in a fish hatchery to the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes.	Oct 11, 1990, 2055	Oct 12, 1990, 0500	Oct 14, 1990	2	EPD	Heavy end of Congress workload in EPD.
5241 PP (HR)—**AN ACT** Making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct 11, 1990, 2207	Oct 12, 1990, 0500	Oct 13, 1990	1	EPD	Combination of House and Senate versions were difficult to put together; heavy workload caused delay in section.

EXHIBIT C—CONGRESSIONAL LATE DELIVERY REPORT FOR MONTH OF Oct. 1990—Continued

[CATEGORY BILLS]

Title	Date/Time Received at GPO	Final Scheduled Date/Time for Delivery	Unconfirmed Delivery Date	Days Late	Area Causing Delay [1]	Reason Given for Delayed Delivery to Congress
5021 EAS (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 12, 1990, 0031	Oct. 12, 1990, 0500	Oct. 14, 1990	2	EPD/PS	EPD delay caused by enormous amount of higher priority items; pamphlet section delay caused by lack of manpower and voluminous amount of material to produce.
5828 IH (HR)—A BILL To make miscellaneous and technical amendments to the Social Security Act.	Oct. 16, 1990, 0033	Oct. 16, 1990, 0500	Oct. 19, 1990	3	EPD	Heavy workload in section; no other explanation provided.
5835 RH (HR)—CONFERENCE REPORT To Accompany H.R. 5835 Omnibus Budget reconciliation Act of 1990.	Oct. 16, 1990, 0210	Oct. 16, 1990, 0500	Oct. 20, 1990	4	EPD/PS	EPD delay caused by heavy workload; pamphlet delay caused by no 2d shift on duty and job sat until third shift.
5769 EH (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 16, 1990, 1856	Oct. 17, 1990, 0500	Oct. 20, 1990	3	EPD	Higher priority items required production which caused this item to wait.
3209 PCS (BYLAW)—AN ACT To modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.	Oct. 16, 1990, 2255	Oct. 17, 1990, 0500	Oct. 21, 1990	4	EPD	Heavy/hectic workload in section.
3016 ENR (SEN)—AN ACT Private Law 101-10 For the relief of Janice and Leslie Sedore and Ruth Hillman.	Oct. 20, 1990, 1832	Oct. 21, 1990, 0500	Oct. 22, 1990	1	EPD	Heavy/hectic workload in section; no other reason provided.

5158 ENR (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry Independent Agencies, Commissions, Corporations, and Offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 20, 1990; 2338	Oct. 21, 1990; 0500	Oct. 23, 1990	2	EPD	Partial delivered on Oct. 23, 1990; remainder delivered on Oct. 27, 1990; delay caused by heavy workload in section.
0303 ENR (SEN)—AN ACT To establish a framework for the conduct of negotiated rulemaking by Federal agencies.	Oct. 22, 1990; 1916	Oct. 23, 1990; 0500	Oct. 24, 1990	1	EPD	Heavy workload in section.
4739 ENR (HR)—AN ACT To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.	Oct. 23, 1990; 0128	Oct. 23, 1990; 0500	Oct. 27, 1990	4	EPD	Heavy workload in section; partial delivery made on Oct. 27, 1990.
0566 ENR (HR)—A BILL To change the effective date for compensation for Members of Congress.	Oct. 23, 1990; 0129	Oct. 23, 1990; 0500	Oct. 26, 1990	3	EPD	Heavy workload in section.
5241 ENR (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 23, 1990; 0207	Oct. 23, 1990; 0500	Oct. 26, 1990	3	EPD	Delay caused by hectic schedule in section and number of higher priority jobs.
5268 ENR (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 23, 1990; 0208	Oct. 23, 1990; 0500	Oct. 25, 1990	2	PD	Partial delivery made on Oct. 25, 1990: delay caused by number of changes required on proofs submitted to Congress; section did not get the required approval from Congress to release remainder of job until Nov. 3, 1990.
2830 ENR (SEN)—CONFERENCE REPORT To Accompany S. 2830 Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990.	Oct. 23, 1990; 1934	Oct. 24, 1990; 0500	Oct. 29, 1990	5	EPD	Heavy workload in section: number of higher priority jobs required this matter to sit in section.

EXHIBIT C—CONGRESSIONAL LATE DELIVERY REPORT FOR MONTH OF Oct. 1990—Continued

[CATEGORY: BILLS]

Title	Date/Time Received at GPO	Final Scheduled Date/Time for Delivery	Unconfirmed Delivery Date	Days Late	Area Causing Delay [1]	Reason Given for Delayed Delivery to Congress
0468 ENR (HR)—A BILL To amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the two-tier system for calculating the amount of an annuity paid under the Survivor Benefit Plan for the Armed Forces.	Oct. 24, 1990; 0114	Oct. 24, 1990; 0500	Oct. 26, 1990	2	EPD	Heavy workload in section.
0987 ENR (HR)—CONFERENCE REPORT To accompany H.R. 987 Tongass Timber Reform Act.	Oct. 24, 1990; 0115	Oct. 24, 1990; 0500	Oct. 27, 1990	3	EPD	Heavy workload in section.
1396 ENR (HR)—CONFERENCE REPORT To accompany H.R. 1396 Securities Acts Amendments of 1990.	Oct. 24, 1990; 0119	Oct. 24, 1990; 0500	Oct. 26, 1990	2	EPD	Heavy workload in section.
5257 ENR (HR)—AN ACT Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.	Oct. 24, 1990; 0125	Oct. 24, 1990; 0500	Oct. 30, 1990	6	EPD	Partial delivery made on Oct. 30, 1990; remainder delivered on Nov. 3, 1990; heavy workload in section; hectic schedule.
0358 ENR (SEN)—A BILL To amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.	Oct. 30, 1990; 0100	Oct. 30, 1990; 0500	Nov. 2, 1990	3	EPD/PS	Partial delivery made on Nov. 2, 1990; delay caused by large influx of congressional work in EPD; no 2d shift in pamphlet section to do work and had to sit for 3d shift.

---

[1] EPD: Electronic Photocomposition Division; PD: Press Division; PS: Pamphlet Section

EXHIBIT D

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM
Oct. 30, 1990
REPLY TO ATTN OF: Production Manager
SUBJECT: Memorandum of Appreciation
TO: All Production Department Employees

With combined efforts, cooperation, and knowledge you have accomplished a seemingly impossible task in the true tradition of the Government Printing Office. During the Congressional Sine Die period, from September 5 through October 28, 1990, a total of 181,142 congressional pages were processed through the Production Department typesetting, printing, and binding operations. This was accomplished in addition to a large volume of Federal Register and other agency work. Truly a remarkable performance.

A breakdown of Congressional pages follows:

Congressional Record	13,224
Bills	31,967
Hearings	91,534
Reports	20,739
Committee Prints	23,674
Grand Total	181,138

Congratulations and thanks for a job "Well Done."

Glenn H. Rottmann.

The CHAIRMAN. One thing bothers me about your statement, and I am trying to get on top of that. You say "unwritten agreements," agreements outside law or statutory design. What are you talking about there? Is that where the Public Printer would sit down with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House and they have agreements on what should be done and that is unwritten? Or there is no agreement but yet there is a verbal agreement, verbal contract?

Mr. SMALL. That is correct, sir. Our investigation involved interviews of approximately 17 people that we felt were pertinent to the production of congressional material at the GPO. A number of these persons that we interviewed, particularly in the production department, identified agreements—and, again, I emphasize that these were unwritten verbal agreements—between the production managers and other individuals associated with or in Congress that seemed to set standards for timely delivery. These agreements are not written anywhere that we were able to locate.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems like to me there ought to be a letter saying confirming our conversation of a particular date, and if you have a disagreement with that, you can pass that back and forth, and that sheet would go in the file somewhere.

Mr. SMALL. Such a letter was not identified by our investigator.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not in the Clerk's or the Secretary's office or the Government Printer's office?

Mr. SMALL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Secretary of the Senate has told us that he met with Mr. Houk in September to warn the GPO of the extraordinary demand Congress would be putting on it in October. Is what you are telling us that no contingency plan to deal with that emergency resulted from that meeting?

Mr. SMALL. That is correct, sir. We were unable to identify any contingency plan in our investigation that would address these future high-volume periods.

The CHAIRMAN. What would happen today if Congress suddenly began another very active period where many pages in the Record and a number of hot bills had to be printed?

Mr. SMALL. Based on our investigation, Mr. Chairman, I would have to conclude that late deliveries would again be the direct result.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman?

Representative ROBERTS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have made your point, Mr. Small. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMALL. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Our last witness is Robert Houk, the Public Printer of the United States. I might say this is his second appearance before the committee. Mr. Houk, we remember what you said 6 months ago, and that is one reason I started these hearings: so we could track what you said then and the questions that were asked of you then and where we are today. So you may proceed. I hope you will be as brief as possible so that we might be able to ask you some questions and get out of here in a timely fashion.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT W. HOUK, PUBLIC PRINTER, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, ACCOMPANIED BY BILL HOHNS, DEPUTY PUBLIC PRINTER; RICK BARNETT, CHIEF OF STAFF; AND MIKE DiMARIO, ASSISTANT PUBLIC PRINTER FOR OPERATIONS AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. HOUK. I will be brief, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the JCP. I am pleased to be here today to continue your review on the management of the GPO. I also welcome this opportunity to discuss the JCP's interest in the timely delivery of congressional products.

With me today are the Deputy Public Printer Bill Hohns on my left; my Chief of Staff, Rick Barnett, on my right; and the Assistant Public Printer (Operations and Procurement), Mike DiMario, on Bill's left. Mike's area includes all of GPO's production functions; that is, from the commencement of the insertion of data from the Congress through to the final product, as well as GPO's Congressional Printing Management Division. Under Bill Hohns' leadership, the GPO officials work closely with the staff of the JCP, the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and the office of the Clerk of the House.

During the closing weeks of the 101st Congress, Bill met daily with these individuals to ensure the expeditious delivery of congressional printing and to coordinate instructions between Capitol Hill and GPO's production resources on a daily basis. I might add that this kind of communication continues. Bill is here also representing expertise in electronics equipment analysis and strategic planning.

In the interest of time, I will briefly summarize my prepared statement, which I have submitted for the record.

When I last appeared before you, it was to discuss my views on the GAO report regarding GPO. Subsequently, we had several discussions with the GAO regarding the report, and GPO has prepared a detailed action plan to respond to the GAO's recommendations. I am pleased to transmit this plan to the JCP today. In summary, our action plan addresses: The management of overtime and equipment utilization; the establishment of a realistic agency goal to reduce paper waste and spoilage; the development of a more comprehensive quality management strategy; the implementation of additional internal control procedures for GPO's printing procurement program, as well as the improvement of information systems used to validate contract performance; also the enhancement of information provided to client agencies; the development of measurable objectives within managers' performance plans; the implementation of measures to make GPO's executive information system more effective; and the development of a usable strategic plan. Actions to implement these plan elements are already under way, and we welcome their review by the JCP.

My prepared statement today includes additional details regarding the results of various management initiatives that have been implemented at GPO over the last several months to improve the efficiency and responsiveness of our operations. In the last several months, we have made significant progress in managing the use of overtime at GPO, and total GPO overtime use has declined. We have implemented new restrictions on controllable expenses. We have increased cooperation with client agencies through a variety of mechanisms, including the Interagency Council on Printing and Publishing Services and the Federal Publishers Committee.

We have completed a study of documents sales pricing that offers new alternatives for broadening consumer access to Government publications through GPO. We are developing a new approach to training at GPO, and we will soon put in place new performance measures for GPO's managers that will improve managerial accountability. We have made sound progress in implementing the plan we developed in consultation with the JCP to increase the Government's use of alkaline paper, and under the JCP's guidance, we are now operating the Government's largest program for the use of recycled paper in Government printing.

We have also made progress in including the number and variety of Government publications in electronic format which we are offering through the GPO's Depository Library Program, and our relationship with the library community has improved substantially compared to recent years.

We will soon submit GPO's equipment requirements for the coming fiscal year to the JCP, and we are at work on both a strategic plan for GPO's future, as well as a legislative recommendation for modernizing and improving Title 44.

All in all, it has been a busy period for GPO since we met here with the JCP last July.

Mr. Chairman, I share the interest of everyone here today regarding GPO's timely delivery of congressional products. These products are essential to the conduct of legislative business.

Throughout its history, GPO has made the fulfillment of congressional printing needs its first priority. I assure you that this priority will not change while I am Public Printer.

However, in October 1990, during the final weeks of the 101st Congress, there were instances in which the delivery of some congressional products was not timely. These instances have been disclosed by the preliminary findings of an internal management review I ordered, focusing on the procedures involved in the production of congressional printing, and they are detailed in my prepared statement. They have also been documented by GPO's Inspector General (IG), as we have just heard. I have received both the administrative and supplemental reports of investigation prepared by the IG, as well as the IG's management implications report. These are being given my careful consideration.

The IG's report disclosed five instances during October when the Congressional Record was delivered late. The internal management review I requested, disclosed six instances when the Record was delivered late. The difference in findings may be attributed to different interpretations of the production records pertaining to the Congressional Record of October 18. In addition, my internal management review disclosed that subsequent parts of the Record of October 16 and October 19 were delivered later than the succeeding day as per the usual practice for the delivery of parts under the laws and rules for the publication of the Congressional Record. Both my internal management review and the IG's investigative reports found that all other Record deliveries during October were made on time in accordance with the understanding regarding the delivery which were in effect during that period. These understandings are detailed in my prepared statement, and in my view, they are critical to any assessment of GPO's performance during the closing weeks of the 101st Congress.

In the instances of late delivery disclosed by my internal management review, I believe that the extraordinary circumstances prevailing during that period affected GPO's performance. In my view, these circumstances were as follows: An unusually heavy printing workload compared to previous closing sessions of Congress; frequent changes in priority scheduling which resulted in the later delivery of some congressional products by prior understanding between Congress and GPO; and in some instances an imbalance of workload and work force in GPO's prepress area and, to some extent, in the Binding Division; and isolated instances of equipment malfunction.

In most of the instances of late Record delivery, I want to point out that lateness was offset to an extent by the delivery of advanced copies—normally 101 copies for the Senate and 340 copies for the House—with final Chamber delivery following shortly thereafter. I also want to point out specifically that I do not regard these instances of later delivery as being in any way attributable to a lack of effort on the part of GPO's work force to provide Congress with its essential printing needs. Their dedicated efforts were recognized by official letters of appreciation.

These circumstances aside, Mr. Chairman, Congress is entitled to prompt delivery of congressional products, and I will continue to strive to ensure that both Title 44 and the laws and rules for the publication of the Congressional Record are upheld. My assessment of these circumstances has pointed to the need for improvement to the policies and procedures for congressional printing in order to ensure that Congress' requirements for the timely delivery of essential legislative products are met. I believe this assessment has been confirmed by the GPO's Inspector General.

Plans for achieving internal improvements to GPO's congressional printing operations are already under way. As I have described in my prepared statement, I have authorized the hiring of 40 additional employees for the proof and copy markup section and GPO's prepress area. Additional steps will be taken as a part of a contingency plan to maximize GPO's responsiveness to Congress during heavy congressional workload periods. These steps will include:

The establishment of personnel target levels in all key GPO production areas that are sufficient to process heavy end-of-season congressional workload;

The development of alternative measures to provide management with the flexibility to reallocate production personnel to meet short-term heavy workload requirements. Such measures could include reassignment of plant personnel, recalling GPO personnel detailed outside of the plant, and other measures;

A review of existing procedures for the restriction of annual leave use among supervisors and employees during heavy workload periods;

An analysis of existing production standards, to ensure that the standards are sufficient to process heavy workloads effectively;

The review of training opportunities for current and new personnel, and the reallocation of training resources to ensure that adequate job skills are on-hand to meet periodic workload increases;

The continuation of an effective equipment maintenance plan to prevent malfunctions during heavy workload periods;

The review and acquisition of new equipment and technologies to enhance GPO's capability to be responsive to congressional workload demands; and

A review of current work reporting systems to ensure that the appropriate data is acquired and stored to manage GPO's activities and performance during heavy workload periods.

As I noted in my letter to Senator Stevens last fall regarding the management of overtime, we would also like to explore the possibilities for establishing program contracts to process certain categories of congressional work during heavy end-of-session workload periods. I would not object to such an approach, provided that congressional printing could be processed in an effective, efficient manner, without interrupting the orderly conduct of legislative business.

Also, we are going to continue discussions with the JCP, the office of the Secretary of the Senate, the office of the Clerk of the House, and other congressional offices concerning external improvements in congressional printing procedures that can be undertaken during the 102d Congress.

As a result of all these steps, I can assure you that Congress can look forward to an era of improved cooperation, communication, and coordinating with GPO regarding the fulfillment of its printing needs.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity on behalf of the GPO to commend you for your leadership of the JCP over the last 2 years. Your guidance has been particularly helpful to me during the last 10 months, and your contributions will have lasting benefits for the Government and the public we serve.

This concludes my opening statement. Once again, I appreciate this opportunity to be here this morning, and I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Houk follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT W. HOUK

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP), I am pleased to appear before you today as you continue your review of the management of the Government Printing Office (GPO). I also welcome this opportunity to discuss the JCP's concerns regarding the timely delivery of congressional products.

When I last appeared before the JCP on July 19, 1990, it was to discuss my views on the draft General Management Review of the GPO, which was conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) at the request of the JCP. The report was published by the GAO in September 1990, together with my comments.

Subsequently, I had the opportunity to meet with the Comptroller General of the GAO and his staff to discuss the GAO report and the measures we plan to implement to achieve the recommended improvements. At that time, we agreed that the GAO's assistance and review would be beneficial in implementing these measures. I am pleased to inform you that, in a demonstration of GAO/GPO cooperation, joint presentations of GAO's report and GPO's response have been made to client agencies and other interested groups. I look forward to continued cooperation between GPO and the GAO in addressing the issues highlighted by the GAO's report.

GPO has prepared a detailed action plan to address the GAO's recommendations. I am pleased to transmit this plan to the JCP today. My statement today includes additional details regarding the results of various management initiatives that have been implemented at GPO over the last several months to improve the efficiency and responsiveness of GPO's operations.

I assure you that I share the JCP's interest regarding GPO's timely delivery of congressional products. These products are essential to the conduct of legislative business. Throughout its history, GPO has always made the fulfillment of congressional printing needs its first priority, and that priority will not change while I am Public Printer.

During the final weeks of the 101st Congress, however, there were instances in which the delivery of some congressional products was not timely. These instances have been disclosed by the preliminary findings of an internal management review I ordered, focusing on the procedures involved in the production of Congressional printing. They have also been documented in a report of GPO's Inspector General (IG), following an investigation requested by the JCP [GPO IG, "Administrative Report of Investigation concerning Late Deliveries of Congressional Publications by the U.S. Government Printing Office," January 4, 1991: and "Supplemental Report of Investigation," January 18, 1991].

I want to point out specifically that I do not regard these instances of later delivery as being in any way attributable to the efforts of the entire GPO workforce to provide Congress with its essential printing needs in the closing weeks of the 101st Congress. Their dedicated efforts have been recognized by official letters of appreciation.

The preliminary findings of the internal management review I ordered have identified the need for internal and external improvements in Congressional printing policies and procedures, in order to ensure that Congress' requirements for the timely delivery of essential legislative products are met. These findings have been confirmed by the IG's investigative report and by an additional document supplied to me by the IG, entitled "Management Implications Report Concerning Late Deliveries of Congressional Publications by the U.S. Government Printing Office" (January 18, 1991).

Plans for achieving internal improvements will be implemented at the earliest possible date. We will continue discussions with the JCP and other appropriate Congressional offices concerning improvements in Congressional printing policies and procedures that can be undertaken during the 102d Congress.

GPO ACTION PLAN

The plan I am submitting today addresses all of the recommendations included in the GAO report on GPO management. Plan elements address the management of overtime and equipment utilization; the establishment of a realistic agency goal to reduce paper waste and spoilage; the development of a more comprehensive quality management strategy; the implementation of additional internal control procedures for GPO's Printing Procurement Program, as well as the improvement of information systems used to validate contractor performance; the enhancement of information provided to client agencies; the development of measurable objectives within managers' performance plans; the implementation of measures to make GPO's Executive Information System more effective; and the development of a usable strategic plan. We welcome JCP'S review of the action plan I am submitting today.

MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

Over the last several months I believe we have made sound progress in several key management areas.

Overtime Management. We have made a concerted effort to improve the management of overtime use at GPO, and that effort has been successful. For FY 1990, the total number of overtime hours used by GPO was reduced by over 11 percent compared to the overtime used in FY 1989. The pattern of overtime reductions has continued into FY 1991. Total GPO overtime hours in the first quarter of the fiscal year were down by over 18 percent from the first quarter of FY 1990.

In GPO's Production Department, where the majority of overtime hours are used, total overtime use declined by 7 percent in FY 1990 compared to the previous year. Production Department overtime reductions continued into the first quarter of FY 1991. Despite an increase in overtime use in the Electronic Photocomposition Division (EPD) to meet heavy Congressional printing requirements in October 1990, total Production Department overtime use declined by 1.5 percent compared to the first quarter of FY 1990.

Significant reductions in administrative overtime have also been achieved, as a result of instructions to GPO's managers which I issued on July 15, 1990. During August and September 1990, the number of administrative overtime hours dropped by approximately 60 percent compared to average levels in the first 10 months of the fiscal year. In the first quarter of FY 1991, administrative overtime was down by approximately 60 percent compared to the first quarter of FY 1990.

The GAO report made a number of recommendations to reduce overtime in its report on GPO. The GAO also prepared additional recommendations at the request of the JCP, which were forwarded to me in September 1990 by Senator Ted Stevens. I commented on these recommendations in a letter I sent to Senator Stevens last Fall. Our response to all of these recommendations is contained in our action plan. Further, as I informed Senator Stevens, I have received a report from GPO's IG which contains other recommendations to improve internal controls over overtime use. GPO's Assistant Public Printers have agreed to implement the IG's recommendations that are applicable to their areas.

Other Cost Reduction Measures. We have taken a variety of other steps to control GPO's costs. In my memorandum of July 15, 1990, I established restrictions on spending for certain travel and training, subscriptions, and other areas, and required all proposals to fill positions above grade PG-11 to be reviewed by my office.

These restrictions were supplemented by a memorandum of December 14, 1990, outlining cost control guidelines for FY 1991. Cost control guidelines were further imposed on all personnel actions, overtime, training, travel, performance awards, maintenance contracts, and engineering projects and furniture requests. This memorandum also outlined the cost control measures that were adopted, following consultation with the JCP, to implement the deferral of funds from GPO's appropriated funds programs that was agreed to by Congress in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1991.

Increased Cooperation With Client Agencies. Last Spring, I arranged for the establishment of several working groups comprising representatives of GPO and member agencies of the Interagency Council on Printing and Publishing Services (ICPPS) Co-develop recommendations to address 22 separate issues associated with GPO's printing and binding services, responsiveness to clients' needs, and GPO's Sales of Publications Program. In July and September, these groups reported a variety of measures to resolve the issues raised by the ICPPS. Virtually all of these measures have been implemented.

Over the last several months, the Deputy Public Printer and GPO top management have made a number of visits with ranking printing and publishing officials in client agencies to discuss and resolve issues of importance to them. To date, 13 agencies have been visited, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Transportation, Justice, Interior, Health and Human Services, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor; the General Services Administration (GSA); the Internal Revenue Service; and the U.S. Postal Service. Additional visits, including follow-up visits, are being planned and continued.

Several discussions have been held with the management of the GSA to work out arrangements for continued GSA/GPO cooperation in the implementation of Brooks Act requirements for the procurement of "mixed resource" electronic printing and publishing systems. Discussions are also ongoing to determine and establish parameters for the conduct of duplicating services by GSA's agency printing plants within the guidelines of Title 44 and the JCP's Government Printing and Binding Regulations. We will keep the JCP fully apprised of our progress in these discussions.

Sales Pricing Panel. The final report of the Panel on the Pricing of Sales Publications has been released. The report recommends several alternatives for improving the methods of pricing and distributing Government documents sold to the public by GPO. The report recommendations are being developed for implementation. These recommendations represent major steps forward in broadening public access to Government publications.

Employee Training. Under the guidance of the Deputy Public Printer, GPO has established a working group comprising a cross-section of GPO management, and including labor representation, to develop a comprehensive training program for GPO's employees. In addition to devising appropriate on-site training and apprenticeships to ensure that employee job and technological skills are matched with critical GPO requirements, this program will devise training to provide injured employees with the opportunity for a return to meaningful employment.

Performance Standards. In response to the GAO's recommendation, new performance standards are being developed for all of GPO's senior managers, including all staff heads reporting to the Office of the Public Printer and all Assistant Public Printers. The goal of this effort is to establish measurable performance standards that can be used to ensure managerial accountability for achieving goals and objectives established by the Public Printer. The standards developed for senior GPO managers will be used by them to establish the standards to be met by their subordinate supervisors. The new standards will be put in place during the second quarter of this fiscal year.

Alkaline Paper. In April 1990 GPO issued a plan, developed in consultation with the JCP, to increase the amount of alkaline paper used to print Government documents deemed to be of enduring value. The plan involves a number of elements on which progress was made during the latter half of fiscal year 1990, and which are projected to be fully in place by the end of this fiscal year.

Recycled Paper. Under the direction of the JCP, GPO has been successfully operating one of the Government's most advanced programs for the procurement of recycled paper to be used in Government printing. As you know, a number of significant changes to GPO's recycled paper program were instituted by the JCP this past Summer. These changes had the effect of extending the coverage of GPO's paper purchases to a greater number of categories of paper than are currently covered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines.

At the same time, at the request of the JCP, we evaluated the feasibility of obtaining newsprint that is consistent with the 40-percent post-consumer waste minimum content standard established by the EPA guidelines, for use in the production of the Congressional Record and the Federal Register in fiscal year 1991. Based on this evaluation, we concluded it was possible to procure such paper, but that a heavier-weight paper would be required to ensure proper printing performance. As a result, this paper would entail an increased cost in the Record and the Register distribution programs. On the expiration of our current newsprint contract, we will reevaluate market conditions for recycled newsprint and transmit our recommendations to the JCP.

Equipment Modernization. Last year, at my request, the JCP returned a number of equipment modernization proposals that had been pending. We are completing our analysis and review of these proposals, and by early next month we will submit to the JCP a list of those proposals we have deemed immediately necessary to our equipment modernization plans. The list will include some previously returned items plus new proposals. All proposals will be incorporated into our strategic plan, which is currently being developed.

Publications in Electronic Formats. We have made sound progress in carrying forward GPO's commitment to making Government publications in electronic formats available to the public, in line with the growing transition to electronic formats and the JCP's guidance in this area.

We expect to conclude GPO's five electronic pilot projects—including the Census, EPA, and 1985 Bound Congressional Record CD-ROM's, the Commerce Department Electronic Bulletin Board, and the Department of Energy on-line project—this year. Evaluation procedures have been put in place for all of these projects, in cooperation with the issuing agencies and the GAO. These projects will yield important information about the cost and feasibility of disseminating Government information in electronic formats to Federal depository libraries.

Our involvement in electronic formats is not limited to the pilot projects, however. On Nov. 1, 1990, Project Hermes, an electronic bulletin board project that provides depository libraries with access to Supreme Court slip opinions, went into operation at GPO, and since then nearly 100 libraries have made use of this service. In addition, as more electronic publications in CD-ROM and diskette format have become available in recent months, we have been including them in the publications made available to depository libraries. Five new electronic products have been sent out over the last several months, four are planned for distribution this month, and another six are currently in the planning stages. Expanded distribution of these formats through GPO's Depository Library Program will make a greater amount of Government information available to the public at a lower cost to the Government than comparable ink-on-paper formats.

Strategic Planning. As detailed in our action plan, GPO has implemented a comprehensive strategic planning process to guide our operations in the future. The plan will comprise eight major components, addressing GPO's: product stratification matrix, workforce, training and recruitment, facility needs, equipment needs, structure, resources, and environment and legislation. The development of the plan has been tasked to GPO's Office of Planning, with the full collaboration of the Deputy Public Printer. In addition to inputs from GPO management, the plan will provide for inputs from other stakeholders in GPO's future, including GPO labor, the JCP and Congress, client agencies, the library community, the private sector printing and information industries, and other key groups.

Legislative Call. Last year, legislation affecting GPO—including the House and Senate Paperwork Reduction Act Reauthorization bills and H.R. 3849, the Government Printing Office Improvement Act of 1990—was not enacted. As you know, this legislation contained key provisions that would have statutorily clarified GPO's existing authority to disseminate Government publications in electronic format.

Although I believe that Title 44 contains a sufficient presumption of authority for GPO to act effectively in the emerging Electronic Age, it is nevertheless an aging statute which needs to be brought up to date with current operational and organizational conditions. Consequently, we have commenced a comprehensive review of Title 44 with the objective of developing a legislative package of possible reforms. We will present this package to the JCP for your review and guidance as soon as it is formulated.

Delivery of Congressional Products

The preliminary findings of the internal management review I requested regarding the delivery of Congressional products have been confirmed by the findings of the IG's Administrative and Supplemental investigative reports. From these reports I have concluded that:

(1) legislative business in the closing weeks of the 101st Congress generated an unusually heavy printing workload, compared to previous closing sessions;

(2) GPO management was advised by the JCP, the Office of the Secretary of the Senate (OSS), and the Office of the Clerk of the House (OCH), to expect an increased workload during the closing weeks of the 101st Congress. As a result, a continual dialogue with these offices was maintained to expedite the printing and delivery of essential documents;

(3) priority scheduling resulted in the later delivery of some Congressional products by prior understanding between Congress and GPO; and

(4) in some cases, the timely delivery of Congressional products was affected by an imbalance of workload and workforce in the EPD, and to some extent in the Binding Division, and there were isolated instances of equipment malfunctions. These are areas in which GPO management action will be taken to ensure effective GPO performance of Congressional delivery requirements in the future.

Comparison to Previous Closing Sessions. The volume of legislative business in the closing weeks of any Congressional session is typically large. This was especially true during the closing weeks of the 101st Congress. GPO's Production Department statistics show that in the period between the end of the Labor Day recess (September 5, 1990) and adjournment on October 28, 1990, legislative business generated a total of 181,138 original pages of work for processing through GPO's typesetting, printing, and binding operations, including 13,224 pages for the Congressional Record; 31,967 pages of bills, resolutions, and amendments; 91,534 pages of hearings; 20,739 pages of Committee reports; and 23,674 pages of Committee prints. By normal standards, this comprised an unusually heavy workload.

Comparative data for the number of Congressional Record pages printed during other closing sessions of Congress follows:

Congressional Session: last two weeks	Congressional Record pages
99th Cong., 2d Sess	4,917
100th Cong., 1st Sess	3,386
100th Cong., 2d Sess	4,596
101st Cong., 1st Sess	4,105
101st Cong., 2d Sess	7,976

Of the five most recent closing sessions 1986-1990, the number of Record pages generated in the closing two weeks of the 101st Congress exceeded the next greatest number of pages for any comparative period (generated in the closing period of the 99th Congress, second session) by 62 percent. The least number of pages were generated in the closing period of the 100th Congress, first session. This number of pages was exceeded during the most recent period by 136 percent.

The Congressional work produced by GPO during October 1990 was required in addition to other work for Federal agencies, including the Federal Register and work requisitioned by the Department of the Army for Operation Desert Shield. The IG's investigative reports did not disclose any instances of late deliveries for the daily Federal Register during that period. We are not aware of any instances in which the timely delivery of Congressional products was affected by agency work performed in-house at GPO.

GPO Production Workload and Personnel Resources. Production data for the final month of the 101st Congress shows the larger-than-normal workload processed by GPO during that period compared to the rest of the year. For all FY 1990, the average number of printed pages processed per week by GPO was 12,574. This included both Congressional and agency work. During the four weeks of October 1990, the average was 29,411 pages of Congressional and agency work, exceeding the normal weekly average by 134 percent.

Since 1986, GPO has operated under statutory ceilings on the employment of full-time equivalents (FTE's). Comparative data on Production Department personnel resources that were available for processing end-of-session Congressional work in recent years is shown below:

Month of	Personnel in			Total
	EPD	Press	Binding	
October 1986	676	723	655	2,054
December 1987	644	695	604	1,943
October 1988	626	687	595	1,908
November 1989	505	663	596	1,764
October 1990	463	624	579	1,666

In EPD, available personnel have declined by 32 percent since October 1986. While automated typesetting functions have enabled EPD to absorb most of the effects of this staffing attrition, heavy typesetting workloads were met in the most recent period with increased use of overtime, as shown below:

Month of	EPD Regular Hours	EPD Overtime Hours	Ratio of Overtime to Regular Hours
October 1986	124,433	21,883	17.6%
December 1987	118,580	16,342	13.8%
October 1988	105,092	23,868	22.7%
November 1989	88,920	14,865	16.7%
October 1990	85,202	23,966	28.1%

Despite the increased ratio of overtime use, however, the number of available EPD personnel were not sufficient, in some cases, to process the unusually large amounts of copy that were received late at night in the closing weeks of the 101st Congress.

Congressional Workload Forecast. GPO management was advised to expect an increased Congressional workload by the JCP, the OSS, and the OCH prior to the commencement of the closing session of the 101st Congress.

In response, overtime restrictions on the Production Department and associated support areas were lifted, in order to ensure increased workforce flexibility to meet Congressional workload demands. Some Production areas restricted annual leave authorizations. Efforts were also undertaken to temporarily reassign some GPO Details to Congress to work at the Central Office plant, and to re-assign proofreaders from the first to the third shift.

In addition, the JCP, the OSS, and the OCH maintained a continual dialogue with GPO management during the closing period regarding priority requirements for Congressional printing. There was no absence of communication between GPO and Congress concerning the delivery of Congressional products.

Rules for the Delivery of the Congressional Record. Rule 4 of the "Laws and Rules for the Publication of the Congressional Record" states:

When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9:00 p.m. in order to insure publication in the Congressional Record issued on the following morning; and if all of the manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Congressional Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Congressional Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12:00 midnight.

In practice, however, GPO prints as much of each day's proceedings as possible for delivery the next morning regardless of when copy is submitted. If there is an unusually large volume of Record copy, or if the copy is submitted late at night, GPO determines whether a Record should be "cut" so that at least some proceedings can be made available by the time Congress convenes the next day. Depending on the amount of copy that is "cut" from the Record, the balance of the proceedings are either included with the following day's issue, or printed as subsequent parts and delivered the next day.

In August 1990, an understanding was reached between GPO and the JCP staff regarding the timely delivery of the Congressional Record that effectively sanctioned this longstanding GPO practice.

This understanding was precipitated by an incident concerning the Record of July 30, 1990. GPO received instructions from the OCH that House Conference Report No. 101-650 was to be printed in its entirety in the Record prior to delivery the next day. Given the size of this report (which made 80 printed Record pages) and the time of its submission to GPO (11:25 pm., July 30), this requirement represented a unique circumstance. Normally, conference reports that are impractical to print in the Record and deliver in a timely manner (because of their size and/or the time of their delivery to GPO), are "cut" from that day's proceedings and printed as a separate document. The separate document is delivered on a timely basis, and the report is either printed as a separate part of the Record and delivered the next day, or continued with the next day's Record proceedings. In this case, the full report was printed in the Record for July 30, but delivery was not made to the House and Senate until the afternoon of July 31.

With the understanding that was reached in August 1990, GPO agreed to continue the current practice of printing as much as possible of each day's proceedings, regardless of the time of their submission, for delivery to the House and Senate prior to their convening the next day. In order to ensure the delivery of complete

Records, GPO was permitted to deliver the Record up to one-half hour following the convening of the House and Senate, if GPO determined that it was possible to print the entire day's proceedings. In no case, however, was the one-half hour allowance allowed to operate beyond 10:30 am. This understanding tacitly maintained the standing GPO practice to deliver "cut" Records prior to the convening of the House and Senate, and to deliver the balance of any proceedings from "cut" Records the next day.

In the final week of the 101st Congress, another understanding for the delivery of the Record was reached among GPO, the JCP, the OSS, and the OCH. This was due to the massive amounts of Record copy GPO was receiving each day, the late hours of copy submission, and changing priorities for printing and delivering all conference reports, enrolled bills (including the 13 major appropriations bills), as well as other bills and reports requested by the Congressional leadership which were necessary to the completion of legislative business.

Under this understanding, the highest priority was assigned to the products requested for immediate delivery by the Congressional leadership. Complete Records were still required to be delivered within 30 minutes of the House and Senate convening (the allowance was still not allowed to operate after 10:30 a.m.). As before, the Record was allowed to be "cut" as necessary in order to meet other Congressional priorities, and "cut" Records were to be delivered prior to the House and Senate convening. However, while the balance of proceedings from "cut" Records were still required to be delivered as soon as possible thereafter, their delivery could be delayed by more than one day in order to meet delivery dates for higher priority products.

In practice, this understanding resulted in changes in the types of proceedings that were included in "cut" Records. For example, in those cases where it was determined that a major conference report could be made available to Congress more quickly in the Record than as a separate document, the decision was made to include the report in the "cut" Record in advance of previous proceedings because that information had a higher priority. In other cases, the printing of conference reports in the Record was delayed because it was determined that a separate document could be produced and delivered more expeditiously. In all cases, daily—and frequently, hourly—changes in priorities determined the schedule for printing the Record and other Congressional products in the final weeks of the 101st Congress.

Performance During October 1990. The IG's Administrative and Supplementary Reports of Investigation disclosed 5 instances during October 1990 when the Congressional Record was delivered late (October 12, 15, 16, 17, and 26). The internal management review I requested disclosed 6 instances when the Record was delivered late (October 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 26). In addition, it disclosed that subsequent parts for the Records of October 16 and October 19 were delivered later than the times specified by the operative understanding of August 1990.

The internal management review also disclosed that the "cut" Record of October 4 was delivered late, but with the prior approval of the OSS so that a conference report could be included in the "cut" issue. The balance of proceedings for the October 4 issue were printed with the proceedings of October 5 and delivered on time.

Both my internal management review and the IG's investigative reports found that all other Record deliveries during October were made on time, in accordance with the operative understandings.

Late Deliveries. In the instances of late delivery disclosed by the internal management review, the last issues of 6 Records were delivered later than the times specified by the August 1990 understanding between GPO and the JCP staff (the issues of October 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 26). In addition, the subsequent parts for the Records of October 16 and 19 were delivered late. In some cases, however, there were extenuating circumstances. Also, in most cases lateness was offset to an extent by the delivery of advance copies (normally, 101 copies for the Senate and 340 copies for the House), with final chamber delivery following shortly thereafter.

Five of the above-mentioned instances occurred in the third week of October (involving the Records of October 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19), when the heavy workload gave rise to the understanding for the later delivery of Congressional Record parts that was implemented in the final week of the session.

The specific information follows:

(1) **Late Delivery of Complete *Record*.** The October 12 Record was delivered after the 30-minute allowance following the convening of the Congress, in this case the House only. However, the House convened for only 8 minutes on Saturday, October 13, and the Senate did not convene.

On October 12, the Senate recessed at 11:50 p.m. The House recessed at 4:37 pm. GPO received the last Record copy at 1:43 a.m. on October 13 and opted to complete rather than "cut" the Record. However, the large amount of manuscript required additional time to complete this issue.

The House was scheduled to convene at 10:00 a.m. on October 13. The Senate did not convene again until 9:30 a.m. on October 15. The House recessed at 10:08 a.m. on October 13. The October 12 Record was delivered to the House at 12:32 pm., and to the Senate at 12:25 pm., on October 13.

(2) **Late Delivery of "Cut" *Record*.** The October 15 Record was "cut" and delivered after the Senate and House convened on October 16, due to a large amount of late copy received and a broken shear pin in the Group 59 Record presses, which caused a 30-minute production delay. The balance of proceedings was delivered with the next day's issue.

On October 15, the Senate recessed at 8:31 p.m. The House did not recess until 1:05 a.m. on October 16. GPO received a large amount of copy at 4:25 a.m. on October 16. About 312 pages of House proceedings and 15 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 15 issue. These were printed in the Record for October 16.

The Senate was scheduled to convene at 9:00 a.m. on October 16. The House was scheduled to convene at 10:00 a.m. Advance copies of the October 15 Record left the GPO bindery at 9:47 a.m. for the Senate and 9:50 a.m. for the House. Delivery of advance copies normally takes about 20 minutes, so these copies arrived at the Senate at approximately 10:07 a.m., and at the House at approximately 10:10 a.m. Final chamber delivery was made 1 hour and 23 minutes after the Senate convened and 24 minutes after the House convened.

(3) **Late Delivery of "Cut" *Record* and Subsequent Parts.** The October 16 Record was "cut." Part I was delivered after the Senate convened on October 17, but before the House convened on October 17, due to large amounts of late copy. Because of higher priorities for other work, Part II was not delivered until October 19.

On October 16, the Senate recessed at 10:01 p.m. The House did not recess until 1:01 a.m. on October 17. GPO received the last Record copy at 3:15 a.m. on October 17. About 392 pages of House proceedings and 15 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 16 issue. The House proceedings were delivered as Part II of the October 16 Record, on October 19. The Extensions of Remarks were delivered in the October 18 Record, on October 19.

The Senate was scheduled to convene at 9:00 a.m. on October 17. The House was scheduled to convene at 10:00 a.m. Advance copies of the October 16 Record left the GPO bindery for the Senate at 9:00 a.m. and for the House at 9:08 a.m., arriving approximately 20 minutes later. Final chamber delivery of Part I was made 40 minutes after the Senate convened and before the House convened.

(4) **Late Delivery of "Cut" *Record*.** The October 17 Record was delivered after the Senate convened on October 18, but before the House convened, due to large amounts of late copy. The balance of the proceedings were printed with the October 18 Record and delivered the following day.

On October 17, the Senate did not recess until 12:29 a.m. on October 18. The House recessed at 10:36 p.m. GPO received the last Record copy at 2:42 a.m. on October 18, with a stack of copy 6¼ inches high coming in between 1:26 and 2:42 a.m. Approximately 109 pages of Senate proceedings and 20 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 17 issue. These were printed in the Record for October 18.

The Senate was scheduled to convene at 9:00 a.m. on October 18. The House was scheduled to convene at 10:00 a.m. Advance copies of the October 17 Record left the GPO bindery for the Senate at 9:27 a.m. and for the House at 9:33 a.m., arriving approximately 20 minutes later. Final chamber delivery was made 51 minutes after the Senate convened and before the House convened.

(5) **Late Delivery of "Cut" *Record*.** The October 18 Record was "cut." Part I was delivered after the Senate and House convened on October 19, due to large amounts of late copy. Part II was delivered before the House convened the next day (the Senate did not convene on October 20).

On October 18, the Senate did not recess until 1:54 a.m., October 19. The House recessed at 8:45 p.m. GPO received the last Record copy at 3:45 a.m. on October 19.

The Senate was scheduled to convene at 10:45 a.m. on October 19. The House was scheduled to convene at 11:00 a.m. Advance copies of Part I left the GPO bindery for the Senate at 11:56 a.m. and for the House at 12:10 p.m., arriving approximately 20 minutes later. Final chamber delivery was made 1 hour and 45 minutes after the Senate convened and 1 hour and 40 minutes after the House convened. Part II was delivered before the House convened at 12:00 noon on October 20.

(6) **Late Delivery of Subsequent Part.** The October 19 Record was "cut" due to a large volume of late copy. Advance copies of Part I were provided to the House

ahead of the scheduled 12:00 noon session on October 20. The Senate did not convene that day. However, Part II was not delivered until October 22, when it was delivered before the House and Senate convened. In the interim, the House convened on October 21. The Senate did not convene that day.

On October 19, the Senate did not recess until 12:44 a.m. on October 20. The House recessed at 7:58 p.m. GPO received the last Record copy at 3:05 a.m. on October 20. About 203 pages of Senate proceedings and 30 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 19 issue.

Advance copies of the October 19 issue left the GPO bindery at 11:34 a.m. and arrived ahead of the scheduled 12:00 noon House session. Production of higher priority Congressional work delayed the delivery of Part II until each House convened at 10:00 a.m. on October 22.

(7) **Late Delivery of "Cut"** ***Record.*** In the final week of the 101st Congress, due to a large volume of late copy, the October 26 Record was "cut" and delivered to Congress after the Senate and House convened, and thus not within the understanding that was operative at that time. The additional proceedings were not printed until later, but this was in accordance with the understanding regarding the later delivery of Record parts that was in operation in the final week of the session.

On October 26, the Senate did not recess until 12:52 a.m. on October 27. The House recessed at 7:01 a.m. on October 27. The last recorded time for the receipt of Record copy was at 3:40 a.m. A stack of Record copy 18 inches high was submitted to GPO between 1:00 a.m. and 3:40 a.m., with approximately 9 inches of copy coming in at 3:40 a.m. There is no record of when the last House copy for the Record was received. Approximately 423 pages of Senate proceedings and 846 pages of House proceedings were cut from the October 26 issue.

The Senate was scheduled to convene at 9:00 a.m. on October 7. The House was scheduled to convene at 3:00 p.m. Advance copies of Part I left the GPO bindery for the Senate at 9:48 a.m., arriving approximately 20 minutes later. Final chamber delivery was made 1 hour and 27 minutes after the Senate convened, and about 4½ hours before the House convened. Parts II and III of the October 26 issue were delivered on October 31. Part IV was delivered on November 2. Congress adjourned on October 28.

Other Deliveries. Also within the final week, the issues of October 22, 23, 24, and 25 involved the later delivery of multiple parts. Part I of each of these issues was delivered on time but, due to large amounts of late copy and higher Congressional workload priorities, delivery of the subsequent parts varied, sometimes with a several day lag time. This was within the understanding that applied to the production of the Record during the final week. Specific information on these four issues follows:

(1) On October 22, the Senate did not recess until 12:21 a.m. on October 23. The House recessed at 9:54 p.m. GPO received the last Record copy at 3:00 a.m. on October 23.

Approximately 100 pages of Senate proceedings, 593 pages of House proceedings, and 25 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 22 issue. Part I was delivered to Congress before it convened on October 23. Part II was delivered 1 hour and 33 minutes after the Senate convened on October 24 and an hour and six minutes after the House convened that same day. Part III was delivered before Congress convened on October 25.

(2) On October 23, the Senate recessed at 11:24 p.m. The House recessed at 9:48 p.m. GPO received Record copy at 1:51 a.m. on October 24, with some copy still outstanding. About 105 pages of Senate proceedings, 491 pages of House proceedings, and 20 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 23 issue. Part I was delivered before Congress convened on October 24. Part II was delivered on October 29, after Congress adjourned.

(3) On October 24, the Senate did not recess until 1:02 a.m. on October 25. The House recessed at 12:30 a.m. on October 25. GPO received the last Record copy at 3:02 a.m. on October 25. Approximately 147 pages of Senate proceedings, 154 pages of House proceedings, and 25 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 24 issue. Part I was delivered on October 25 before Congress convened. Part II was delivered on November 5, after Congress adjourned.

(4) On October 25, the Senate recessed at 10:52 p.m. The House recessed at 10:09 p.m. GPO received the last Record copy at 1:40 a.m. on October 26. Approximately 139 pages of Senate proceedings, 314 pages of House proceedings and 30 pages of Extensions of Remarks were "cut" from the October 25 issue. Part I was delivered before Congress convened on October 26. Part II was delivered on November 6, after Congress adjourned.

Finally, the last issue of the Record for the 101st Congress, dated October 27, was delivered as three parts: Part I on October 29, Part II on November 3, and Part III on November 5. The Senate adjourned sine die at 2:17 a.m. on October 28, and the House adjourned sine die at 2:02 a.m. on October 28.

Delivery of Other Congressional Products. With regard to GPO's delivery performance on other Congressional products, including bills, conference reports, calendars, and other items, the preliminary findings of the internal management study I ordered have not disclosed anything different from the findings made by GPO's IG. The IG found that 22 bills were delivered late during October. The IG's report attributed these late deliveries to heavy workloads, changing Congressional priorities, and an imbalance between the workforce and the workload in the EPD and the Pamphlet Section, Binding Division.

Recommendations. In my view, the foregoing analysis does not indicate the need to establish new rules for the delivery of the Congressional Record and other essential legislative products. The understandings that were in effect during the closing weeks of the 101st Congress were established by agreement of all concerned parties—the GPO, the JCP, the OSS, and the OCH. These understandings ensured that both Congress and GPO were provided with the necessary flexibility to meet the printing needs of the Congressional leadership and expedite the conduct of legislative business. In general, I believe these understandings were effective, and I look forward to continuing to work closely with the JCP and House and Senate personnel in setting priorities for the production of Congressional work.

In those specific instances where GPO delivered the Record and bills later than the agreed-upon times, it is clear that in key areas—particularly EPD, and in some instances the Pamphlet Section—there was an imbalance between the workload and the workforce. In at least one instance, an equipment malfunction on the Group 59 presses also contributed to a delay. These problems can be remedied by management action.

As I have informed the JCP, I have authorized the hiring of 40 new employees for EPD. This will enhance personnel resources in that area. GPO also has 16 printer-proofreader apprentices who will become journeymen in the near future.

Based on my review of GPO's performance in the closing weeks of the 101st Congress, I have determined that GPO needs to take several actions to ensure that Congress' needs for the timely delivery of essential legislative products are met in the future. The substance of these actions has been confirmed by the IG's Administrative and Supplemental investigative reports, and by the Management Implications Report which has just been provided to me. These actions will include:

(1) a detailed analysis of personnel needs in all key GPO production areas, with the objective of establishing personnel target levels sufficient to process heavy end-of-session Congressional workloads;

(2) the development of alternative measures for the production areas to provide management with flexibility to reallocate personnel to meet short-term heavy workload requirements. Such measures could include reassignment of plant personnel, recalling GPO personnel detailed outside of the plant, and other measures;

(3) a review of existing procedures for the restriction of annual leave use among supervisors and employees during heavy workload periods;

(4) an analysis of existing production standards, to ensure that the standards are sufficient to process heavy workloads effectively;

(4) the review of training opportunities for current and new personnel, and the reallocation of training resources, to ensure that adequate job skills are on-hand to meet periodic workload increases;

(5) the continuation of an effective equipment maintenance plan to prevent malfunctions during heavy workload periods;

(6) the review and acquisition of new equipment and technologies to enhance GPO's capability to be responsive to Congressional workload demands; and

(7) a review of current work reporting systems to ensure that the appropriate data is acquired and stored to manage GPO's performance during heavy workload periods.

Taken together, these actions will comprise a contingency planning effort to meet future periods of heavy Congressional workloads. This planning effort will be discussed and reviewed with the JCP and other appropriate Congressional personnel, and will be incorporated into GPO's strategic planning process.

Conclusion. Providing Congress with the timely delivery of Congressional products has always been GPO's highest priority, and it will remain so. These products are essential to the daily conduct of legislative business and the fulfillment of Congressional responsibilities in our constitutional system of government. GPO management and GPO's employees are committed to assisting Congress in the fulfillment of those responsibilities. The plans and actions, with the guidance of the JCP and the participation of Congress, will assure that GPO continues to perform its mission of service to Congress effectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Houk.

Let me make the main point here again, if I may. The need of the Congress is to have available to it a record of each House's previous day's activities and also to have copies of bills being considered before they are the business of the moment. I know it is a tough job, but the business of legislating is a whole lot more difficult than a lot of people think. And your job and my job is to make it easier for the Congress where we can.

I like your statement where I believe you said that the rule of thumb is to print as much of the Record as you possibly can, no matter how late the copy may come in the door. I believe that is in fact what this committee needs you to do. Further, we want you to be able to print all the Record so it is available on the following day, whether it has to be one, two, or three volumes, to meet various deadlines. Congress just can't be waiting 4, 5, 6, 9 days to read the official version of what happened. The same is true with hot bills. They can't wait.

We need you to devise a way so you are not calling the Secretary of the Senate, you are not calling the Clerk of the House, the Speaker's office, or the JCP, to tell them you can't handle all the work and asking for a priority list of what they must have first. Don't wait until it is too late to do something about it, and then ask for a way out. We have got to work the way out first.

Do you think you have a plan here that will satisfy that need?

Mr. HOUK. Yes, we do. I think when the JCP reviews the action plan response to the GAO and when they review our contingency plan to deal with extraordinary workloads, I think you will see that we are in a position to say that, under the current arrangement, we would not fail the Congress if a future situation like the last one occurred again. However, your comment that we should have sufficient resources to have all, including the parts, even if it requires two, three, four, five volumes, delivered the next day, that is a new mandate that was not prevailing up until now. And we will be willing to go back to the drawing board and now develop an expanded contingency effort to deal with that requirement.

My understanding is you would like that requirement to prevail every day, so that requires a whole new report or reaction to the manning and the equipment analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. But your interpretation and my interpretation are quite different. I think that whatever we say today ought to be on the desk tomorrow, and that is your job. At least I hope you understood that when you came on board.

Mr. HOUK. I understand it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are going to understand it a whole lot better before we get through, too, I will tell you that.

To what degree does your hiring proofreaders ease the problem you had in October?

Mr. HOUK. Well, certainly 40 additional personnel in that area is a vast enhancement to the capability of that section.

The CHAIRMAN. When do they start to work?

Mr. DIMARIO. Mr. Chairman, we went out and attempted to get our proofreader roster together. At the time we sought to go out, there was no existing roster of proofreaders at the OPM. So we had to go out and advertise our needs for the 40. At that time, we did advertise through OPM on the East Coast of the United States only. We did not do a nationwide survey.

We obtained through that process and through the labor unions, in asking them to also get interested applicants to apply, some 200 applicants. We extended the time of bid in that process when we first went out at the specific request of our Equal Employment Opportunity office because they wanted to ensure that we had minority applicants as well as other applicants. And we acquiesced to that, and properly so.

Among the 200 applicants, all of them took the examination at OPM. Now, all 200, give or take, whatever the specific number is, were people who had completed a 4-year apprenticeship because that was the requirement that exists, that these people be qualified proofreaders before they take the exam. The examination is one that had been created by GPO and OPM a number of years ago, and we have used successfully. It has brought in quality people to us.

With that, there was a screening of the 200, and ultimately 113 people were—again, that is an approximate number—were available for some sort of certification. Those applications were reviewed. We now have 52 of that number certified to us by OPM. That number is in-house right now. We will review those 52. They don't send over all 113 because they only have to send over a certain percentage over the 40 that we have requested under their rules. That is why we have the 52.

We are reviewing those right now. We will then make the selection of the 40. We will send those back to OPM. These are the procedures that are established. OPM will then make a review to make sure that we hit the rule of three with respect to veterans' preference and a whole range of other laws that are in process. Then they will give us names back of those that are qualified. We anticipate that process will be 6 to 8 additional weeks from today.

The Chairman. So roughly 2 months.

Mr. DiMario. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. It will be the first of April before you can start hiring.

Mr. DiMario. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Well, I will ask you a question, and you can disburse it, if you want to? Do you have the authority to hire directly from the union halls for a day's work or a week's work?

Mr. Houk. I don't know that answer. Does anybody?

Mr. DiMario. We do not.

The Chairman. Well, shouldn't you set up an agreement with your unions to do that?

Mr. DiMario. I assume we could set up an agreement with the union. Whether or not it would be lawful, given the civil service laws that are in place——

The Chairman. Well, can't you hire emergency employees for short periods of time?

Mr. Houk. It is my understanding we are prohibited from doing that, but I will certainly take another look at it to see whether it is lawful to do so. We are working under the premise of——

The **Chairman**. You have some fine union representatives over there, and I am sure they will try to cooperate because it is just as important to them to get the job done and not have it reflect on them.

Mr. **Houk**. They do cooperate.

The **Chairman**. So I think they would be more than willing to try to work out an agreement with you on very short notice. But I just think that is one way you could get day-to-day or week-to-week work or something.

Mr. **DiMario**. Mr. Chairman, if I can further address that, my understanding of the law as it exists today, following civil service law there is a provision as to temporary hire.

The **Chairman**. Sure.

Mr. **DiMario**. Temporary hires require the same kind of competition in application as we are going through right now for permanent hires. Now, I will look into that further, but——

The **Chairman**. Well, you could already have a stack of temporary hires to be qualified, and you could jerk those off the list and call the hall and tell them you would like to have those people down there.

Mr. **DiMario**. I understand fully that that would be the most expeditious way to handle it.

The **Chairman**. Sure.

Mr. **DiMario**. And if we can do that, we certainly will do it. My understanding is that currently we are not in a position to do that because of law.

The **Chairman**. Well, just don't get too persnickety—that is not a good word, is it?

In October, Mr. Houk, you took back some of your employees who were details to Congress. Don't you have a number of employees detailed to the executive branch?

Mr. **Houk**. I am sure we do. Do you have that answer?

Mr. **DiMario**. Yes, we do.

The **Chairman**. How many?

Mr. **DiMario**. I believe there are 36. I think that is the correct number.

The **Chairman**. Since you took them away from Congress to try to help you, couldn't you take some of those back from the executive under emergency needs?

Mr. **DiMario**. We certainly could, and that was suggested by your staff director during this 2-week period of time, as was the union hall hiring procedure at that time. Of those 36, not all are people who are employable in the Electronic Photocomposition Division. Their skills are not the same. Moreover, if we brought them back in, these are people who would have to go through a short temporary period of training in order to be functional in the skills that we need. Even though they are proofreaders, they may not be people who are up to skill in the functional areas that we are actually performing with respect to the Congressional Record. So if we had a longer term than 2 weeks, certainly we could bring them back and utilize them. But a 2-week period of time was not really reasonable.

The **Chairman**. The gentleman on my right down here has had some experience in the printing business. I suspect that if he had somebody that had long-term experience, it would take less than 2 weeks. You don't forget how to milk a cow overnight.

When you were here in July, Mr. Houk, you told us how bothered you were by your visit to the Rapid Response Center (RRC) at the Navy Yard. Isn't that correct?

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was RRC used in your October crisis?

Mr. HOUK. Only to the extent that it was applicable, which was not very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you use some of those people to help you out in a pinch?

Mr. HOUK. If those people are capable of contribution, we have no reluctance to call them in. Absolutely!

The CHAIRMAN. You don't have to go through the 2 weeks' training for those people in RRC, would you? How many do you have down there?

Mr. HOUK. About 150, maybe.

The CHAIRMAN. And they weren't utilized.

Mr. DIMARIO. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. They weren't utilized.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not utilized, and the statement by the Public Printer said he was dismayed by the lack of work down there. And here is a group of people that you never touched, and we needed help, you needed help, and they stayed down there because you say they couldn't have helped you anyhow. How do you know?

Mr. HOUK. My assumption is that if they would have been able to make a contribution, I would have called on them. But I will be happy to look into that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would. I would hate for you to assume anything. I don't like the way it is spelled.

Have you considered reducing the size of your management and administrative team so you can bring in more experienced personnel in the procurement and production areas?

Mr. HOUK. It is a given that that is automatic.

The CHAIRMAN. What is a given?

Mr. HOUK. It is a given that that review of all personnel matters, including the levels of management, is ongoing right now and, if it is inappropriate, will be modified. At this point, I haven't made any decisions that would warrant such actions. And I am not so sure that the skill levels in existence at this time are not adequate.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been making a study? Are you going to make a study? You haven't started one yet?

Mr. HOUK. Oh, no. It is almost complete.

The CHAIRMAN. Almost completed.

Mr. HOUK. The equipment analysis is almost complete. The personnel analysis is almost complete. The action plan to the GAO was submitted today. The strategic plan is within weeks of completion.

The CHAIRMAN. I always find that when you have a hearing it is like visitors coming. You clean the house and get it polished and ready so it won't look so bad when they get there.

Mr. HOUK. That is not the case in this.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have a package there for me today. I doubt if I would have gotten it this week if we had not had this hearing. But, nevertheless, it is one of the reasons for the hearings.

Mr. HOUK. It was due at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the reasons we have the hearings is so that we can kind of keep the dust off the books.

Does your 5-year strategy plan envision an electronic version of the Congressional Record?

Mr. HOUK. It does, and I will defer that to the deputy who is honcho-ing that project for me.

Mr. HOHNS. That is being evaluated at this time. I expect that that will be completed next week. There are several technical questions that remain to be answered that only certain manufacturers will be able to provide the answers to. It would be my expectation that electronic versions of the Record will be available during that 5-year period.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been working on this so you can evaluate it and have it done in the next week or so?

Mr. Hohns. I have been working on it the last 4 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. Four weeks.

Mr. Houk, the Inspector General has an authorized staff of 35. When are you going to let him go ahead and hire people to fill the vacancies, because looking at the list——

Mr. HOUK. The Inspector General has taken the position that 35 are adequate to meet his needs. I had a review of his proposed organizational changes just in the last few days, and we are considering maybe two more. But we are both in agreement that that personnel level is appropriate for his mission at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. How many does he have on staff?

Mr. HOUK. He is in the thirties, I believe. Is he in the room?

I would say 35 at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. He has all 35 of them?

Mr. HOUK. Well, he has 35 approved FTE's, and he may be short maybe four or five positions that he is filling. But they are authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all filled?

Mr. HOUK. No. I said——

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I asked you. I said when are you going to let him hire them.

Mr. HOUK. They are authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. They are authorized, sure.

Mr. HOUK. Yes, and he has permission to hire.

The CHAIRMAN. He can go ahead and hire them today?

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Good. That is on the record. I think I will quit. Congressman, do you have some interest in this?

Representative ROBERTS. A very keen and personal and strong interest, Mr. Chairman, as I know you are aware of.

Bob, as Frank Sinatra has said, it is not easy being green or being the Public Printer, but I think you will persevere. This thing reminds me of that TV ad for a private mail carrier that is on television, where the fellow has 16 phones. He says, "Can you get the information from the West Coast to the East Coast," et cetera, et cetera. He says, "I can do that," "I can do that," "I can do that," hangs up the phone and says, "How am I going to do that?"

The Chairman. Fly Northwest.

Representative Roberts. I suppose.

I wish it were possible for you to have a contingency plan ready when the Inspector General and all Members that are vitally interested in this and all of the people are peering over your shoulder. You list several goals or several proposals involved in a contingency plan and by law or agreement or contract or past practice you can't do that, it is a little difficult to put the contingency plan into effect. I sympathize with that.

Let me just refresh my memory, as we have heard the other witnesses and the statements. The chairman has gone over this to some degree, and I want to make sure all information is understood. Your equipment analysis status will be due when?

Mr. Houk. That is within a few weeks, I believe. Is that correct, Bill?

Mr. Hohns. Friday, February 1, it will be over at the JCP's office.

Representative Roberts. Is that Groundhog Day? Is that appropriate?

The Chairman. The 2d is, I believe.

Representative Roberts. OK, the 2d.

Mr. Houk. Congressman, that is on schedule. That was the date we expected to complete it.

Representative Roberts. I was aware of that, and I knew it was going to be at the end of this month or the first of next month. But obviously that is going to be helpful.

I have a letter here from you as of July 25 on my inquiry regarding your reviewing the study proposal that I submitted to you for an on-line system for the delivery of the Congressional Record. It is a very nice letter back. You are saying now that that is going to be when?

Mr. Hohns. That will be available next week.

Representative Roberts. Is that called the Roberts' On-Line Study, if it is a good one?

Mr. Hohns. It is, sir. [Laughter.]

Representative Roberts. Thank you.

Mr. Houk. The only thing we are waiting for is some technical information from a number of private sector providers.

Representative Roberts. Can we get that done in the 102d Congress?

Mr. Houk. No, sir.

Representative Roberts. I am very disappointed with that answer.

Mr. Houk. I don't believe the Congress would even consider beginning to give me the resources that it would take to do that during this session.

Representative Roberts. Probably not.

On training, I made some comments before about the 11,000 keystrokes. You have a proposal in the brown packet, or I guess you have another training report that is going to be available soon?

Mr. HOUK. Well, we are under a mandate to deliver to the JCP a strategic plan, as well as the action plan response to the GAO. Included in that strategic plan is the training matrix.

Representative ROBERTS. Am I correct in saying that the average key-striking capability here is 11,000, and it is about twice as much in the private sector? Are people in retraining that just can't do the job? The chairman went on and on and on about where we can get some people legally to come in and do these kinds of things when we hit something. Is it possible or are we——

Mr. HOUK. Mike, why don't you pick it up?

Mr. DIMARIO. I think the 40 that we are going out for now are for proofreading. We did the same thing with respect to people who are doing the key-stroking, that we certainly could get an adequate group of people.

Representative ROBERTS. Well, I don't mean to interrupt you. In terms of proofreaders and key-stroking, hiring people, and getting the Record on time, I am not finding fault with the Public Printer and your shop at all—people crawl out of train wrecks faster than we can get these people on board. If the Dodge City Globe had the same kind of problems that you have to go through with OPM requirements, we would never get anything done.

Mr. DIMARIO. I agree.

Representative ROBERTS. It is incredible. Now, I thought that the Congress had a voluntary compliance with OPM requirements if, in fact, there was an emergency declared. And what you are telling me is that your understanding of the law is that we have to follow OPM guidances. You know, we can't be opposed to that, but we have a job to do. And whether it is with the union, with emergency people or whatever, and we got into a thing here with the RRC down at the Navy Yard. As a practical matter, are those people up to par?

Mr. HOUK. Congressman, they are up to par to the classifications they are in, but those classifications weren't necessarily the ones we were looking for to deal with this chaos.

Representative ROBERTS. Translated, it means yes, that they can't do the job.

Mr. HOUK. Well, they can do the jobs they are assigned, but that wasn't the job we needed for assistance.

Representative ROBERTS. I see. OK. Square peg, round hole.

Can we explore this business of what the law allows you to do?

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

Representative ROBERTS. We have to prevent this from happening in the future. This is ridiculous in terms of——

Mr. HOUK. I wonder if I can make a comment.

Representative ROBERTS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HOUK. When we were advised of the potential heavy workload coming during this event, no one, including the people who advised us, had any idea of the ultimate size of the workload. We felt confident that, with the maneuvers we could employ, we could take the July load which was described to us was going to be slightly in excess of that, and we could have handled the situation. The load was so huge and it came in at such a rush, trying to get into the funnel at one time, that is when we obviously made it clear we had to develop a contingency plan. That plan will be in place in case that event occurs again. But no one predicted the situation that occurred in October, and that is why we will have a plan to deal with that if it ever occurs again.

Representative ROBERTS. I think we need to get something clarified right away, that there is some expeditious means of handling the personnel needs on a faster basis without circumventing the intent of the law. Several suggestions have been made by the chairman, and as you can tell, I have some blood pressure about it. Let me calm down a minute and say two things. Xerox and Kodak—and I am not trying to promote anything here—have the equipment now to be on line in binding capability, as I understand it.

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

Representative ROBERTS. I can't remember the exact name of the outfit, but at any rate. And what I said before with the Clerk and the Secretary of the Senate will happen. I mean, if we get into a crunch and, in fact, you can be on line and bind this stuff, sooner or later you're going to be shut down and replaced.

Now, I would like to know if that kind of equipment does exist for what is on the Record as opposed to extraneous remarks and revising and extending and all the other stuff?

Mr. HOUK. Yes. You are dealing with an example of the Xerox Corporation product called Docu-Print or Docu-Tech. We have already explored that piece of equipment. It may have valuable use and applications for an interim small number of copies to be reproduced on line over to maybe your office or the Senator's office. But I think Bill can respond to the realization that that inquiry approved that that machinery or any machinery like it cannot, in fact, handle volume reproduction.

Why don't you address that briefly?

Mr. HOHNS. That is, in fact, one of the sources outside that I am waiting upon before I can release the document to the JCP that will deal with your thoughts. Knowing that people are going to rely upon their representations, they are being particularly cautious about at what state that equipment is in. There are questions as to whether or not it can drive from certain files. They have indicated verbally it can but are unwilling to commit to it at this moment. There are also valid questions about its speed and capabilities.

Those are the questions that need to be resolved.

Representative ROBERTS. You know, it has to be a reliable piece of equipment tested over the long term.

Mr. Chairman, you indicated you would like to get out of here by noon.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right. I want to make a point that you are making on the equipment you are discussing. It is now in our service department, and that is what we used to print the bills we didn't get from GPO. We used that to print the bills here, and we got through very nicely.

Representative ROBERTS. The last comment I want to make is that you are very much aware, Bob, of the hearings we had on recycling.

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

Representative ROBERTS. Under Chairman Bates on the House side. You know that we have a number of Members of Congress mandating that you do certain things in the recycling area, and most of those bills, as we determined, would have been very counterproductive in terms of the mandates on your bidding procedure and how you approach the goal. You mention in your testimony the fact that you are making progress in the recycling area. I would sure like to have that so we can continue to go down the road toward the recycling goal, but not get into legislation mandating things that will make it much more difficult for you to achieve that purpose.

Mr. HOUK. We can submit that to you, but I might add that under the leadership of Senator Ford, we have one of the great recycling programs in progress. And we have even extended it to products that aren't required to be included under EPA regulations. In our procurements, we are getting 98 percent of our requirements met on recycled material. However, we will not be able to do it yet on the Congressional Record or the Federal Register due to the performance of the material on our particular equipment.

I will submit a report to you, if you would like.

Representative ROBERTS. In essence, what you are doing is repeating what you said at the hearing. The only thing that is changed is the number of cosponsors on the bills that you preferred not to have because of the mandates involved in how you bid, et cetera, et cetera, and the supply and whatever. And I can recall that hearing when the proponents of one thing were actually, in terms of the law of unintended effects, being counterproductive to the goal that the chairman shares and you share and I share. And if we have up-to-date reports on a success story, it will make my job a lot easier.

Mr. HOUK. You shall have it rapidly.

Representative ROBERTS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the problems we run into is cost. We have been slowly but surely overcoming that particular problem as we get more and more people into the recycling business. I think the performance has gone pretty well.

Let me thank everyone for participating today. I hope the new chairman will hold hearings like this in the future.

I have questions submitted by Senator Glenn for Mr. Small and the Public Printer.

The CHAIRMAN. I and other members of the committee may have additional questions that they would like to submit. With the agreement of my colleagues, the record will remain open for 30 days, and staff will see that questions are promptly addressed.

Anything else? If not, this hearing is adjourned.

Mr. HOUK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

[The questions of Senator Glenn follow:]

QUESTIONS FOR HON. ROBERT W. HOUK

Question 1. Under previous Public Printers, the Office of the Inspector General has been exempt from obtaining approval to hire outside of GPO. Do you intend to continue this policy? If not, why not?

Response: As of July 1990, I instituted a policy requiring my review of all requests to fill vacant positions from outside the agency. However, it has been my policy to date, and it will continue to be my policy, to permit and encourage the Inspector General to fill vacancies by recruiting and hiring the highest caliber candidates from any appropriate source either inside or outside of GPO. I believe he has already begun this process by initiating recruiting actions at area colleges.

Question 2. You informed Senator John Glenn that you had authorized 22 audit positions for the Office of Inspector General. Why is the Audit Section of the Office of Inspector General not at full complement?

Response: The Audit Group of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) is authorized 22 FTE's. In July 1990, I directed that all requests for outside hire authority be reviewed by my office in the context of a comprehensive effort to impose broad spectrum cost containment measures. Outside hire requests were received from the OIG for a total of 13 fill actions, all within the Audit Group in December 1990. Because this number, when added to the number of audit personnel on board exceeded the FTE limit, I requested the Inspector General review his fill requests and resubmit those which, in his judgment, still merited action and which were within the FTE ceiling. Inspector General Small responded to my request in January. Furthermore, the Inspector General presented a reorganization plan to me which streamlined the Audit, Investigative, and EDP activities. The staffing and the level of positions will reflect the importance of the OIG functions, and will allow the office to attract quality personnel. I expect the entire OIG office will be at full complement as soon as these vacancies can be advertised, applications received, selections made, and reporting dates established.

Question 3. We understand that the Inspector General had a problem obtaining records from the Director of Planning during the course of an official audit. Have you prepared a directive instructing all GPO staff to provide the Office of Inspector General access to all internal records? If not, why not?

Response: I have issued instructions to all of senior management that they are to cooperate fully with the Office of the Inspector General in any investigation the IG is conducting, and they are to provide the IG with any records or information which the IG requests of them or any of their subordinate offices.

These instructions were the final result of an exchange of internal memoranda between the IG and my office. Initially, several months ago, the IG requested my assistance in obtaining a specific draft document from the Office of Planning, and also asked that I announce a policy concerning access to other agency documents which he determined were necessary in carrying out the responsibilities of his office. In my responsive memorandum, I recognized his broad authority to obtain agency documents and other information, and assured him that we would in no way impede the performance of the IG's mission. While I believed that my memorandum was clear as to my support for his statutory authority and the responsibilities of his office, the IG requested further clarification of certain language concerning procedures to be followed in the transfer of information. I then issued a second memorandum, reasserting my support and recognition of the OIG's mission within the agency, and clarifying the steps we would take to insure the IG's receipt and access to essential documents. It was in this memorandum that I also instructed GPO management officials, and others in a supervisory capacity, to give their full cooperation to the OIG during the conduct of official audits or investigations.

I have attached copies of the four memoranda to which I refer in this response.

QUESTIONS FOR MR. LEWIS L. SMALL

Question 1. How many audit reports has the OIG issued since your appointment as Inspector General? Audits terminated or suspended since your appointment?

Response: 26 audit reports have been issued, 14 have been terminated and 4 have been suspended, approximately 2 such actions per month.

Question 2. We understand that the OIG is presently authorized 22 full-time audit positions and that you are down to 15. Why are you not at the authorized level?

Response: We actually dropped below our authorized complement between December, 1990 and January, 1991. We submitted personnel action requests to fill these vacancies on a timely basis, as well as others as early as November, 1990. For the most part, we are still awaiting action on these requests.

Question 3. What experience level do the remaining 15 auditors in your office possess? Is your office lacking any expertise due to defections from the office?

Response: The experience level in my audit staff ranges from 6 months to 9 years. The capability of the GPO/OIG to carry out its responsibilities has been impaired. Our losses are recapped to show their impact on our level of expertise.

We lost most of our trained financial statement auditing team (including two CPA's). They worked with GAO to gain the experience needed to do the financial statement audits in future years.

We have lost our expertise in contract claim auditing. Our most experienced auditors have left. We also suffer from a lack of proper mix of audit skills. Many EDP staff losses have diminished the office's audit skills and institutional knowledge. We can cope with those losses if I am permitted to staff at a high enough grade level, both management and subordinate, to allow me to address priorities with appropriate audit and management skills.

Question 4. Are you able to recruit auditors from outside the GPO to get up to your authorized complement level? If not, why not?

Response: When I first became Inspector General, I reviewed past hiring practices of this office and determined that the majority of employees had been hired from other agencies and outside organizations. With the belief that we should seek the best available personnel for available funding levels and that outside employees were necessary to maintain an independent approach to our functions, I have actively recruited on college campuses and sought applicants from other agencies.

Question 5. Does the GPO/OIG have a hot line for employees and the American public to report waste, fraud and abuse? If not, why not?

Response: We have been working on the development of two "hot lines" for the GPO OIG for a number of months. We intend to establish a "hot line" in the usually recognized sense and also a separate drug "hot line". These lines will be handled separately and will service the Washington, D.C. area as well as regional offices through an 800 number. A preliminary inquiry of the Telecommunications Group indicates that this plan will take time to implement. An example is the fact that it took nearly 3 months to get 3 telephone answering machines out of a request for 5 and one of those was sent back as defective. The "hot line" is a very important issue in this office and we anticipate that when the "hot lines" are in place our workload could increase significantly.

ACTION PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE IN RESPONSE TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT NO. GGD-90-107

"GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: MONOPOLY-LIKE STATUS CONTRIBUTES TO INEFFICIENCY AND INEFFECTIVENESS"

GAO Recommendation

In order to achieve improvements "in efficiency and production quality, the Public Printer should . . . revise current central plant production scheduling practices to reduce weekend overtime, realigning the existing workflow to better utilize the Monday through Friday work week and reduce idle machine and labor time, and contracting out additional congressional and/or agency work to the extent necessary."[1]

GPO Action Plan

While overtime cannot be completely eliminated due to the periodic occurrence of intense Congressional and client agency workloads, there are ways in which improvements to scheduling, reductions in the frequency of weekend overtime, and reductions in the amount of idle machine and labor time can be achieved. GAO procedures and assumptions were faulty in limiting review to jobs coming in on Thursdays and Fridays calling for Monday delivery. A broader approach is necessary to reveal the dynamics of required overtime. In this regard:

- GPO is conducting a review of current workloads along with historical trends. This will aid GPO in anticipating demand levels so that employees can be scheduled accordingly.
- Efforts will focus on establishing lead times for different classes of work.
- The Production Planning and Scheduling Committee will seek to provide realistic schedules through greater cooperation and coordination with Congress and our client agencies.
- Management information on overtime usage has been improved resulting in accurate aggregate and trend reporting, analysis, and action.
- Administrative and support overtime not essential to the support of direct production activities has been eliminated and when required, has been made subject to advance top management approval.

---

[1] U.S. General Accounting Office, Government Printing Office, Monopoly-Like Status Contributes to Inefficiency and Ineffectiveness, Report No. GAO/GGD-90-107 (September 1990), p. 43.

- Contracting out work to reduce overtime will be more stringently monitored by the Production Planning and Scheduling Committee, which will conduct a daily review of these activities.
- GPO will evaluate alternatives for improving integration between production support personnel (e.g., production schedulers and coordinators, materials management, engineering) and Production employees. A new cost reporting procedure has already been established to assist this effort. This procedure will allow for greater control by distinguishing between overtime costs incurred by production support functions versus those costs incurred by Production.
- Automation will be used as a tool for realizing improvements in the area of internal scheduling. For example, GPO will examine the feasibility of designing a computer-assisted, on-line scheduling system within the existing Production Estimating and Planning System.
- The potential for limiting priority work for in-house production through improved scheduling will be explored.
- Previously, GPO has investigated the feasibility of adjusting the regular workweek and establishing a Tuesday through Saturday workweek for some employees. This option will be re-evaluated.
- Management will examine the feasibility of changing the method currently employed by GPO when reporting idle machine and labor time. Efforts will be geared towards more closely aligning GPO's method of reporting with the standards embraced by private industry.
- A review of all existing equipment will be made to determine idle equipment which should be eliminated and which facilities can be consolidated. As new equipment is brought on line, opportunities for consolidation into full three-shift capabilities will be reviewed.
- To address both idle time and improved scheduling, GPO's strategic plan will evaluate alternatives for achieving a better match between GPO' s workload and manpower and equipment resource levels. GPO will also evaluate options for increasing cross-training of personnel which would enable us to reduce idle time attributable to crew reductions or absenteeism.

GAO Recommendation

Paper waste and spoilage were identified as contributing to GPO's high production costs. GAO acknowledged that the uniqueness of the requirements placed upon GPO (e.g., time constraints and a wide variety of short-run work which must be performed for Congress) are in part the cause of high paper waste and spoilage levels. At the same time, GAO also identified machine operator mistakes as a contributory factor. Accordingly, GAO recommended that the Public Printer ". . . establish a realistic agency goal and take action to reduce waste and spoilage." [2]

GPO Action Plan

GPO will take action to evaluate and remedy current waste and spoilage rates. While these rates will probably remain higher than those generated by the private sector, significant opportunities for decreasing waste and spoilage exist. Specific actions will include:

- Increased standardization of publications produced in-house should result in significant savings.
- To achieve a significant reduction of spoilage caused by operator error, GPO will establish improved performance standards and more rigorous management oversight.
- The reduction of paper waste through improved scheduling will also bring about greater efficiencies. This is relevant for work that must be printed on short notice. Due to time constraints, GPO frequently must resort to available paper stock, rather than order paper that might be more suitable for a job. Such a situation can result in both paper waste and spoilage. Improved job scheduling will reduce the incidence of these situations.
- The Production Department has proposed the development of a system that will provide a more accurate accounting of spoilage. The system will be based on the following formula:

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

gross waste (lbs.) trim, run, and make-ready allowance (lbs.) charged to product =
- net waste (lbs.)

Once the system is in place, strict adherence to spoilage accounting procedures will be required. These procedures will enable GPO to identify deficiencies and take corrective action when necessary.

- The longer "make-ready" and greater paper waste generated by much of GPO's older equipment, in comparison with current technology, will be addressed as part of an evaluation of GPO's future equipment needs.

GAO Recommendation

Greater improvements in efficiency and quality could be achieved through a more comprehensive quality management approach to ensure customer satisfaction. Towards this end, the Public Printer should ". . . . adopt a comprehensive quality management strategy that includes the following attributes: (1) production efficiency goals commensurate with industry goals to the extent possible; (2) an approach that emphasizes the prevention of errors, rather than their detection after production; and (3) a customer satisfaction orientation." [3]

GPO Action Plan

According to GAO, GPO's clients have expressed varying degrees of dissatisfaction with the cost, timeliness, and quality of products and services rendered by GPO. For this reason, GPO has made improving and maintaining client satisfaction the management's highest priority. In order to achieve this goal:

- GPO will actively seek out opportunities for incorporating cost-saving technology into our conventional printing operations.
- GPO will take action to reconfigure or eliminate non-essential or non-productive operations.
- Management will continue to examine options to upgrade GPO's facilities and maximize their usage.
- GPO will explore the feasibility of developing a more competitive pricing strategy.
- Efforts will be targeted toward refining production goals to further support GPO's mission. In addition, current operating procedures will be carefully reviewed so as to ensure that established goals can be attained.
- As to GAO's discussion of incorporating a Total Quality Management program within GPO, GPO will address opportunities for implementing a more coordinated approach to quality management in the Central Office plant.
- GPO's Quality Control and Technical Department has completed a draft of the GPO Binding and Finishing Attributes, which contains tolerances and evaluation methods. These are used to determine contract specifications compliance. Presently, GPO is seeking to have the new attributes reviewed by clients and industry representatives prior to formal issuance.

GAO Recommendation

To improve procurement operations, GAO recommended that the Public Printer ". . . establish internal control procedures to collect, validate, and maintain information on delivery performance. Such procedures should require periodic contact directly with customers to validate delivery information." [4]

GPO Action Plan

GPO contract awards are conducted within a well-defined legal framework. Within this framework, GPO will review existing procurement procedures for opportunities to remedy deficiencies cited by the GAO report:

- GPO will review options to institute structural changes in the organization so that the necessary resources in terms of both manpower and equipment for maintaining accurate, up-to-date contractor performance data are on hand.
- GPO will address opportunities for making guidance on contract awards clearer and more accessible to client agencies. These must be more broadly communicated so that clients can acquire a thorough understanding of the conditions under which GPO is authorized to withhold contract awards, and suspend or debar non-compliant Government contractors.
- In accordance with a recommendation by the Interagency Council on Printing and Publications Services (ICPPS), the Printing Procurement Department (PPD) will conduct a comprehensive study to review procedures for gathering, validat-

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

ing, and disseminating contractor compliance data. Areas that will be targeted include the current method of validating delivery information over the telephone; the feasibility of obtaining additional data from client agencies; centralization of contractor compliance data; and the practicability of placing GPO personnel in major contractor plants to monitor production of GPO work.

- With respect to validating information, GPO is now conducting random examinations of shipping and delivery dates provided by contractors. Where discrepancies are found, all shipping documents of apparently delinquent contractors will be subject to an all-inclusive review. Standards will be applied to determine whether the contractor remains eligible to continue bidding on GPO jobs.
- Through a joint effort with the ICPPS, GPO will encourage agencies to report late deliveries/shipments so that this information may be included in PPD's contractors' compliance records.

GAO Recommendation

GAO reported that GPO data concerning contractor performance is not resident in a single, centralized location. While some of the data can be accessed electronically, some cannot and, therefore, must be manually searched. Not only is this cumbersome, but hard copy or paper files which contain contractor information are not readily accessible to everyone. GAO recommended that the Public Printer ". . . . automate, to the extent possible, data on the quality and timeliness of products provided by contractors, or at least make the data more accessible."[5]

GPO Action Plan

The mainstay of GPO's contract administration operations is the computerized Procurement Information Control System (PICS). GPO will evaluate opportunities to improve this system as follows:

- The analysis and programming of software modifications to PICS is underway to allow for the electronic submission of GPO Form 907. These forms are the means by which agencies notify the GPO of schedule changes and late deliveries on their orders.
- A survey is being prepared that will be sent to all PICS users asking for input on modifications needed to the current system, areas that require further automation, and suggestions as to how information can be more clearly presented.
- One of several working groups comprised of representatives from GPO and member agencies of the ICPPS will be asked to review automation efforts and data accessibility and make appropriate recommendations.

GAO Recommendation

According to GAO, GPO contracting officers lack standards and guidance to ensure that contracts are not awarded to contractors with poor performance records. GAO recommended that the Public Printer ". . . issue guidance on the use of quality and timeliness data in awarding contracts."[6]

GPO Action Plan

To improve information resources on contractor performance and more adequately integrate available information into the contract awards process, guidance as to how the data can be most effectively used by GPO's contracting officers needs to be developed and clearly communicated. Toward this end, GPO's plan includes the following:

- Information on the availability and use of quality and timeliness data will be prepared.
- In-house training courses will be modified as necessary to incorporate guidance on the availability and use of appropriate data.

GAO Recommendation

Billing information received by client agencies is inadequate. Consequently, GAO recommended that the Public Printer provide ". . . all customers with more detailed information on their bills, including a brief explanation when actual costs exceed estimates."[7]

GPO Action Plan

GPO's billing and estimating procedures are being addressed based on the following:

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

- Working groups comprised of representatives from GPO and the ICPPS have been established to address this area. Input received from client agencies suggests that additional information is needed on GPO's bills, especially where freight charges and surcharges have been' incurred. To address this concern, GPO has initiated action to revise its automated systems so that whatever billing information a client may require can be provided.
- GPO's Office of Financial Management (OFM) is conducting a survey of client agencies. Once all survey responses are received, every effort will be made to accommodate client needs. The survey also indicates GPO's willingness to provide client agencies with reports of billings to an agency during the year and/or to provide bills in electronic format. Billing electronically will eliminate paper handling, as well as the need for the agency to re-key data into its own system.
- An analysis of the feasibility of listing component costs on certain jobs separately is in process.
- A major focus of efforts in this area will be on job estimates. Under current practices, when GPO provides estimates, some costs are not included in the estimate. For example, the cost of author's alterations, certain shipping charges, and the cost of any change orders the client agency might request after the work has been submitted are not known at the time the estimate is initially developed. GPO will be evaluating alternatives for improving the process by which job estimates are calculated.
- Management plans to review the concept of firm pricing. OPM is presently developing written requirements for modifying GPO's computerized billing and estimating systems that would enable automatic billing of firm estimates to client agencies where possible. An implementation plan is being developed by OFM. Once the plan is completed, copies will be forwarded to the ICPPS for comments. If implemented, the plan would enable agencies to know the cost of most jobs in advance. Firm pricing would also have other benefits. Establishing a firm price before the production phase would both simplify and expedite the billing cycle resulting in a decrease in workload levels for these areas.

GAO Recommendation

To improve client services, GAO recommends that the Public Printer provide ". . . agencies with advance notice when jobs will be produced in-house or when jobs will be delivered late." [8]

GPO Action Plan

The decision to produce a job in-house or have it done commercially entails a series of decisions based on certain considerations such as the specified delivery date, security classification, production capacity, and the availability of paper and/or materials. In response to GAO's findings:

- GPO' s Customer Service Departmental Account Representatives have been instructed to solicit information on *all* possibly-delinquent jobs to ascertain whether the delivery date initially specified will still be met. To ensure that this objective is carried out to the fullest extent possible, the performance plan of each Departmental Account Representative will include this as a criterion.
- GPO will examine the feasibility of billing some in-house work at prevailing commercial rates.
- Software modifications to PICS for the purpose of enhancing access to information concerning in-house jobs are being carefully evaluated. For example, a major focus will be the feasibility of providing this information—including cost—on the PICS screen most frequently accessed by agencies. Making this information available through a single transaction would facilitate the use of PICS and allow agencies to check on the status of their order(s), regardless of whether the work is procured or performed in-house.

GAO Recommendation

To improve Customer Service operations within this area, GAO recommended that the Public Printer develop a ". . . system to regularly solicit and analyze customer feedback to identify trends warranting corrective action." [9]

GPO Action Plan

Efforts to correct deficiencies within this area will include the following:

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

- Customer Service will devise a yearly survey to solicit input from client agencies. Additionally, surveys will be distributed to such groups as the Federal Publishers' Committee and the ICPPS, as well as GPO's Congressional clients.
- GPO has revitalized a more active role in monitoring the concerns of GPO's client agencies. Over a period of several months, the Deputy Public Printer and the Acting Superintendent of the Departmental Account Representatives Division recently conducted (and will continue to conduct) on-site visits to other agencies. The benefits of this type of hands-on information gathering are enormous. Sending GPO top management carries the implicit message that GPO is committed to improving products and services. Secondly, it re-establishes vital lines of communication with client agencies. Third, it will enable GPO to acquire a more comprehensive perspective in terms of adequately addressing their concerns.

GAO Recommendation

"The Public Printer should improve GPO's Customer Service program by . . . improving processes to track and resolve customer complaints, and using complaint information to be more proactive to meeting customers' needs." [10]

GPO Action Plan

In response to GAO's findings:

- GPO will investigate an automated system for collecting, tracking, analyzing, and reporting complaints over the next two fiscal years. However, it is our opinion that complaints represent a very small portion of total jobs processed and that it is more important to devote time to the prompt and satisfactory resolution of complaints.
- The PPD is working with the Office of Information Resources Management (OIRM) toward developing systems which will enable client agencies to enter their Form 907s for reporting scheduling complaints electronically. Plans are also underway to provide electronic submission capability of complaints concerning quality (i.e., Form 1815) as well.

GAO Recommendation

GAO recommended that ". . . where appropriate, top managers' performance plans contain measurable objectives for improving production, procurement, and customer service operations; include achievement of the Public Printer's specified goals and objectives pertaining to managers' functional areas; and contain specific language that can be used to hold managers accountable for performance." [11]

GPO Action Plan

To strengthen management accountability:

- New standard elements are currently being prepared for all positions within the Office of the Public Printer and all Assistant Public Printers. These new elements will ensure that the performance plans of top managers embody measurable criteria where appropriate. Standards will include elements on timeliness, quality, performance, and other aspects cited in the GAO report.
- In addition to the development of quantifiable standards against which managers' performance can be measured, GPO will consider other personnel management techniques such as management-by-objectives and performance planning.
- Previously, attendance at training sessions on standards development offered by GPO's Personnel Service was limited. The course is now open to all GPO supervisors.
- Steps have been taken to provide senior executive staff with a special 3-hour training session. The session was offered several months ago and focused on reviewing performance plans for meaningful job elements and standards.

GAO Recommendation

GAO recommended that the ". . . Public Printer improve the Executive Information Systems (EIS) and encourage its use by identifying the information that is needed to better manage the agency; redesigning the system to meet the information needs of GPO's top managers; and improving the response time." [12]

---

[10] *Ibid., p. 58.*

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

GPO Action Plan

GPO's EIS can be improved by making the system more user friendly and more interactive, and by decreasing response time. In order to garner these improvements:

- The OIRM is presently conducting an internal review of the EIS system so as to pinpoint those areas where changes would be advisable. Once the review has been completed, recommendations will be developed thereto and forwarded to the various department and service heads for comment.
- Subsequent to the impending redesign of EIS to meet the information requirements of GPO's top managers, the need for training managers in the most effective use of EIS and other automated information tools will be closely examined.
- GPO is currently reviewing all OIRM projects so that more up-to-date priorities can be established on which proper resource allocation will be based.
- OPM has been organizationally realigned under the management of the Chief Financial Officer. This should result in greater integration of major financial and program performance data, as well as greater emphasis on the development of key financial and related management information systems.

GAO Recommendation

GAO recommended that the Public Printer ". . . strengthen GPO's planning process by providing more specific direction and ensuring that the current planning process becomes an intrinsic part of GPO's management practices for establishing consensus on agency goals and objectives; involves key external and internal players in the process; and ensuring that strategic planning drives budget development and that workforce and other subordinate plans flow from the strategic plan." [13]

GPO Action Plan

Significant steps are underway to address this recommendation:

- Three broad goals have been established by the Public Printer, each of which has been built upon through the development of supporting objectives. These include the following:
    - (a) maintenance and improvement of satisfaction with GPO's products and services;
    - (b) modernization of GPO's operations; and
    - (c) determination of GPO's future role.
- The first steps toward addressing the critical issues that will bear upon and, ultimately, define GPO's future role have commenced. Issues have been identified based on a continuous dialogue with our operating managers, the structure of the strategic plan has been outlined, and the ensuing steps of data gathering, analysis and evaluation are underway.
- As presently envisioned, the strategic plan under development will be comprised of eight major components, all of which will fall under the immediate direction of the Deputy Public Printer. These include the following:
    - (a) products stratification matrix;
    - (b) workforce analysis;
    - (c) training and recruitment;
    - (d) facility needs;
    - (e) equipment needs;
    - (f) organizational structure;
    - (g) resources; and
    - (h) environment and legislation.
- Given the initial goals and corresponding objectives, the Office of Planning will coordinate the strategic planning process by working closely with the Assistant Public Printers and other Department/Division heads to ensure the development of a cohesive, integrated plan.
- The importance of GPO's strategic planning process is being communicated to all GPO managers. This will provide added assurance for the integration of planning and management activities, and the establishment of linkages between planning, budgeting, and operational decision-making.
- In addition to the policy direction and oversight provided by the JCP, the importance of obtaining input from a variety of sources, both internal and external to the organization, cannot be overstated. As previously noted, working groups have been established on which representatives from GPO and the Interagency Council on Printing and Publications are currently serving. Similarly, efforts will be undertaken to ensure the participation of the GPO's Joint Coun-

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

cil of Unions, client agencies, Congress, private industry, the Depository Library community, and other shareholders having a vested interest in Government information activities and the programs administered by GPO. This will enrich the planning process as well as guard against the potential development of a narrowly construed approach.

○

38-589 (88)